

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 987

UD 010 485

AUTHOR Jacobs, James N., Ed.; Felix, Joseph L., Ed.
TITLE Title I, ESEA Program Evaluation, 1967-68. Program Research and Development.
INSTITUTION Cincinnati Public Schools, Ohio.
PUB DATE Aug 69
NOTE 90p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$4.60
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Administrator Attitudes, Communication Problems, Early Childhood Education, *Elementary Schools, Emotional Problems, Enrichment Programs, *Federal Programs, Health Services, Learning Difficulties, Parent Attitudes, Program Effectiveness, *Program Evaluation, Remedial Programs, *Secondary Schools, Student Attitudes, Teacher Attitudes

IDENTIFIERS Cincinnati, *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I Programs

ABSTRACT

This report comprises a Title I ESEA Program evaluation for 1967-68 in Cincinnati Public Schools. To make greater concentration of services possible, lesser target schools were phased out of the 1967-68 program. The five projects comprising the 1967-68 program were: Elementary School remediation and enrichment; Secondary School remediation and enrichment; emotional, learning, and communication problems; physical health services; and, early childhood education -- the first two mentioned being the major ones. Committees were appointed to overhaul these two major projects, because of reported lack of impact of significance in the diffused nature of services in previous years. The evaluation report surveys the opinions of the teacher and school administrator, and the attitudes of the student and parent, and examines pupil academic achievement, promotion roles, pupil attendance, and dropouts. Summary conclusions for each of these areas are recorded. The report is illustrated with extensive data tables. (RJ)

ED041987

PROGRAM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

TITLE I, ESEA PROGRAM EVALUATION, 1967-68

August, 1969

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM
Cincinnati Public Schools

UD010485

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Editors: James N. Jacobs, Director
Joseph L. Felix, Associate Director
Division of Program Research and Design

TO LEARN ABOUT CHILDREN. THAT CHILDREN MAY LEARN

TABLES

	page
Table 1. Mean Teacher Survey Ratings, ELEMENTARY LEVEL, by School Group, Year, Factor, and Item	9
Table 2. Mean Teacher Survey Ratings, SECONDARY LEVEL, by School Group, Year, Factor, and Item	10
Table 3. Teacher Survey Factor Means, by School Group and Year	13
Table 4. Mean 1968 Teacher Survey Ratings on Eight New Items, by School Group.	18
Table 5. Mean Administrator Survey Ratings, by School Group, Year, Gactor and Item	23
Table 6. Percentages of Favorable Response to Student Survey, SIXTH GRADE, by School Group, Year, Factor, and Item.	32
Table 7. Percentages of Favorable Response to Student Survey, NINTH GRADE, by School Group, Year, Factor, and Item.	33
Table 8. Percentages of 1968 Target School Favorable Response to Student Survey Compared to City-Wide Percentages, by Grade, Factor, and Item	34
Table 9. Percentages of Affirmative Response to Parent Survey, ELEMENTARY, by School Group, Year, Factor, and Item	44
Table 10. Percentages of Affirmative Response to Parent Survey, SECONDARY, by School Group, Year, Factor, and Item.	46
Table 11. Summary of Standardized Achievement Test Grade Equivalents, by School Group, Grade, and Subtest.	56
Table 12. Grade Equivalent Quartiles of (Primary) Target Schools, by Year, Grade, and Subtest	59
Table 13. Average Differences Between Actual Median Sixth Grade Achievement and Medians Predicted from Various School Unit Data, by Type of School, Subtest, and Prediction Source.	61
Table 14. Percentages of Pupils Promoted, by School Group, Year and Grade	67
Table 15. Average Percentage of Daily Absence, By School Group, Year, and Grade	74
Table 16. Dropout Rates, By School Group, Year, and Grade	81

CONTENTS

	page
Tables	ii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
School Groups	2
Project and Component Services	3
CHAPTER 2: RESULTS OF TEACHER SURVEY, 1968	5
Background	5
Description of Survey	6
Method of Analysis	6
Results	8
Conclusions	19
Summary	20
CHAPTER 3: RESULTS OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY	21
Background	21
Description of Survey	21
Method of Analysis	22
Results	22
Conclusions	26
Summary	26
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS OF STUDENT SURVEY, 1968	28
Background	28
Description of Survey	28
Method of Analysis	29
Results	30
Conclusions	39
Summary	40
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS OF PARENT SURVEY, 1968	41
Background	41
Description of Survey	41
Method of Analysis	42
Results	43
Conclusions	50
Summary	51
CHAPTER 6: PUPIL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT	52
Background	52
Method of Analysis	54
Results	55
Conclusions	62
Summary	63
CHAPTER 7: PROMOTION RATES, 1967-68	64
Background	64
Method of Analysis	65
Results	66
Conclusions	69
Summary	70

CHAPTER 8:	PUPIL ATTENDANCE, 1967-68	71
	Background	71
	Method of Analysis	72
	Results	73
	Conclusions	76
	Summary	77
CHAPTER 9:	DROPOUTS, 1967-68	78
	Background	78
	Method of Analysis	79
	Results	80
	Conclusions	83
	Summary	83
CHAPTER 10:	CONCLUDING STATEMENT	84

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This issue of the Journal, which reports the Title I ESEA Program Evaluation for 1967-68, marks the end of a brief era. The first three years of Title I in Cincinnati, i.e., the academic years from 1965-66 through 1967-68, could best be described as a period of diffused services. In each of these years, the Title I funds allotted to Cincinnati, averaging a little less than three million dollars per year, were expended on a variety of services. Although some pupils, designated as project children in accordance with the guidelines, received somewhat concentrated services, provision for the varied needs of a larger population was more characteristic. Counting both public and nonpublic, elementary and secondary, 53 schools received some kind of services in the 1966-67 school year.

By the start of the academic year 1967-68, it was recognized that such diffusion was not the best strategy. Evaluation in the first two years had failed to show any impact of significance. Even when pupils receiving more intensive services were tested in the areas of greatest concentration, they failed to show significantly greater gains than comparable pupils without service. The reader is referred to Volume 4, Number 4 of this journal for "A Summary of Two Years' Evaluation of Title I."

To make greater concentration of services possible, secondary target schools, those with a lesser degree of economic indigence, were being phased out of the program as of 1967-68. The array of services being offered was studied carefully to determine which project components seemed to hold most promise as means of effecting measurable gains in project pupils.

In the spring of 1968, planning for the Title I program took on a new aspect. The 1968-69 school year was designated as a year of change.

Committees were appointed to overhaul the two major projects operating at the elementary and secondary levels respectively. As these committees approached their tasks, the results of the previous two years of evaluation served as an important decision base. But as the newly formulated program began to take shape and more specific decisions had to be made, there was a continuing need for up-to-date evaluation reports. Where questions arose about the effectiveness of specific services, the evaluation staff attempted to process and analyze appropriate data as quickly as possible as an aid to decision making. Thus, the treatment of data from the 1967-68 academic year was concerned more with answering questions as they arose than with structuring a complete evaluation report.

This emphasis, however, left a gap in the report of the history of Title I in Cincinnati. For the sake of continuity, it was necessary to produce some kind of formal evaluation reports for each year. Even a very delayed account might prove useful in future program planning. Toward this end, several project narrative and evaluative papers were edited and presented in Volume 4, Number 4 of this journal. Retaining the distinction of former years between project and program evaluation, this issue reports the grosser kind of evaluation. As program evaluation, it is concerned with the impact of all Title I services on target school pupils.

School Groups

For this report the target school classification includes only those schools identified as primary targets. Because appreciable services were no longer being given to secondary target schools (only library personnel and parent aides were provided), eight elementary and three secondary schools from the secondary target classification were used as a comparison group referred to as "controls." Pupils in these schools seemed most similar in needs to primary target pupils.

The schools in each group are as follows:

TARGET SCHOOLS			CONTROLS	
Garfield	South Avondale	Bloom	Burton	Sands
Hays	Wm. H. Taft	Cutter	Columbian	Vine
Millvale	Washburn	Porter	Cummins	
Peaslee	Washington Park	R. A. Taft	Douglass	Ach
Rothenberg	Webster		Heberle	Heinold
Sixth District	Windsor		Morgan	Sawyer

Projects and Component Services

Because this report is concerned with the collective impact of the Title I program, it seems appropriate to detail the five projects that comprised the program in 1967-68. Each project is listed below together with its component services:

1. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REMEDIATION AND ENRICHMENT. (\$1,323,000)
 - a. Remedial instruction
 - b. Supportive services from administrative aides, resource teachers and (parent) resident aides.
 - c. Educational resource centers
 - d. After-school enrichment program
 - e. Saturday morning enrichment program
 - f. Instrumental music instruction
 - g. Field trips and other sources of cultural enrichment
 - h. Parent study-discussion groups
 - i. Parent leadership training
 - j. Provision of child care
 - k. Summer school
2. SECONDARY SCHOOL REMEDIATION AND ENRICHMENT (\$ 585,000)
 - a. Remedial instruction
 - b. Supportive services from administrative aides, resource teachers, and para-professional personnel
 - c. Welfare services (food, clothing, fees)
 - d. Attendance services
 - e. Guidance and counseling services
 - f. Summer school
 - g. Service and instruction for parents
3. EMOTIONAL, LEARNING, AND COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS (\$ 226,000)
 - a. Self-contained classes for emotionally disturbed and perceptually handicapped children
 - b. Clinical diagnostic teams
 - c. Supportive services of social workers and teacher aides.

- d. Remediation of sub-standard speech patterns of children, teachers, and parents
- e. Inservice teacher training
- f. Medical examination and treatment
- g. Summer camping experience
- h. Summer institutional program for neglected and/or delinquent youth.

4. PHYSICAL HEALTH SERVICES. (\$ 250,000)

- a. Increased nursing and physician service
- b. Health examination for all pupils in grades 4, 7, and 10
- c. Follow-up medical services for remediable defects

5. EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (\$ 188,000)

- a. Psychiatric examination and treatment
- b. Increased psychological and pupil adjustment services headed by psychiatric social worker
- c. Parent education
- d. Employment of kindergarten aides
- e. Establishment of a committee to study and evaluate programs for four and five-year-olds.
- f. Curriculum materials for articulation of programs for four and five-year-olds.

CHAPTER 2

RESULTS OF TEACHER SURVEY, 1968

Background

When the Title I program was introduced in 1965, it was recognized that judgments of the professional staff provided a most useful source of evaluative context and input information. Prior to the introduction of specific services under Title I, professional staff members were queried regarding priority educational needs of the disadvantaged. Teachers were asked to look at the nature of the learner and his community and decide what was needed to provide a good educational program. They were also to consider the existing program and identify deficiencies and areas of current need.

Results of this survey played an important role in structuring the pattern of services in the initial Education Act program. Committees were appointed to study more carefully the need areas identified by the professional staff. On the basis of this study, the program structure was determined.

Shortly after the initiation of the first Title I services, a Survey of Teacher Opinions (also called the Teacher Survey) was constructed to obtain teacher ratings on a number of school program characteristics, most of which were related to the Title I program. This survey was administered in both January and June, 1966. Ratings given by teachers in primary target, secondary target, and control schools were compared. This comparison showed some tendency for primary target school teachers to give higher ratings in June, suggesting that the Title I program was favorably received and seen as serving some of the cardinal needs of disadvantaged children.

This same Survey of Teacher Opinions, with a few small modifications, has been administered near the end of each of the two succeeding years. Responses of teachers to the survey continue to be regarded as valuable in assessing the broad effectiveness of the Title I program and in recognizing areas of continuing need.

Description of Survey

The Teacher Survey is built on the rationale of the semantic differential expounded by Osgood. This theory maintains that when a large group of respondents give evaluative ratings to a series of concepts represented by a word or short phrase, the differences that exist from one individual to another in the exact concept formed will fuse. Thus, these differences become somewhat irrelevant and the set of ratings may be regarded as pertinent to a single concept.

The number of such items on the survey has varied from one administration to another, ranging from 44 in January, 1966, to a high of 50. Thus, it has been possible to take readings on concepts that have become relevant at particular times, dropping some that have become less meaningful. Despite these changes, however, a core of 42 items has been retained, providing a longitudinal measurement of key concepts related to the Title I program and more broadly to the educational program of the Cincinnati Public Schools in general.

The 1968 survey contained 50 items. For each item teachers indicated a rating ranging from 1 (poor) to 7 (good). Thus, a four-point rating would be the midpoint or average.

Method of Analysis

Following the 1966 administration of the Teacher Survey, the results were subjected to factor analysis. A principal components analysis was used, followed by the verimax procedure. The eight-factor constellation was

selected as most descriptive. This same factor pattern was retained for the analysis of 1968 results. Means for each of the factors were computed for each relevant group of schools.

In the two previous years of the survey, it was appropriate to compare the ratings of teachers in primary target, secondary target, and control schools. In the first year the hypothesis to be tested was that primary target teachers would give higher ratings than those in secondary target schools, and that these, in turn, would show higher means than the control group. In 1967 the hypothesis concerned changes in the ratings from the first year to the second. The hypothesis regarding these changes paralleled that of the first year, namely that the primary target group would show highest gains, followed by the secondary target and then the control group. The rationale for both hypotheses, of course, was that teacher ratings would reflect the impact of Title I services, which were concentrated in primary target schools, with a lesser application to secondary targets.

In the 1967-68 school year, however, Title I services were rather completely phased out of secondary target schools. Thus, since the analysis on each of the surveys was to be concerned with changes from preceding years, the previous groupings of PT, ST, and C seemed inappropriate. It was decided, rather, to use schools from the secondary target grouping as control schools in these analyses. The eight elementary schools that most immediately followed the primary target schools in economic deprivation and the three secondary target junior high schools were therefore selected as controls.

The design of the analysis is, then, a two-way (group x year) analysis of variance. Separate analyses were made for each of the two levels--elementary and secondary. The focus of interest is on the year x group interaction since primary concern is with the impact of Title I services in target schools.

Results

Elementary Level. Table 1 compares the mean ratings given to each of 42 survey items by teachers in elementary target schools with those by teachers in elementary control schools. Items reported are those common to all three years of the survey. Within both groups of schools, item means are shown for each of the three years, and the net change from 1966 to 1968 is also reported. Items are grouped and averaged by factor.

Upon cursory examination of Table 1, it can be stated emphatically that elementary target school teachers lowered their ratings of Teacher Survey items in 1968. For all eight of the factors, the 1968 mean is lower than that of the preceding year, and six of the eight means show a decline from 1966. Control school teachers, on the other hand, increased their item ratings within three of the factors from 1967 to 1968, and all factors but one show a gain from 1966 to the most recent year.

Over all 42 items shown in the table, target school ratings declined an average of .41 since 1967 and of .19 since 1966. Total elementary control school ratings, on the other hand, although .23 lower than in 1967, showed a net gain of .33 from 1966 to 1968.

Analysis of variance revealed a significant year effect ($F=5.41$; d.f.2, 246) and a significant year-by-group interaction ($F=3.38$; d.f.2, 246). A t-test of the difference between the mean net changes of the target and control groups showed this difference to be significant ($t=4.11$; d.f. 41). Stated simply, then, the generalized finding is that ratings by elementary control school teachers showed significantly more positive change from 1966 to 1968 than comparable target school ratings.

Table 1. Mean Teacher Survey Ratings, ELEMENTARY LEVEL, by School Group, Year, Factor, and Item.

FACTOR Item	(N)	TARGET SCHOOLS				CONTROL SCHOOLS			
		1966 (337)	1967 (391)	1968 (345)	Net Change	1966 (180)	1967 (208)	1968 (190)	Net Change
FACTOR 1: MORALE									
- Staff morale		4.88	4.89	4.41	- .47	4.44	4.85	4.67	+ .23
- Professional cooperation among school staff		5.24	5.25	4.96	- .28	5.11	5.49	5.08	- .03
- Teacher/Administration cooperation		5.32	5.50	5.20	- .12	4.93	5.36	5.39	+ .46
- Teaching in my school		5.42	5.53	5.19	- .23	5.36	5.56	5.40	+ .04
- Pupil/Faculty relations		4.90	5.02	4.60	- .30	4.74	5.05	4.96	+ .22
FACTOR AVERAGE		5.15	5.24	4.87	- .28	4.92	5.26	5.10	+ .18
FACTOR 2: SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS									
- Provision for emotionally disturbed child		2.51	3.08	2.35	- .17	2.82	3.23	2.31	- .51
- Provision for socially maladjusted child		2.51	3.07	2.42	- .19	2.75	3.12	2.47	- .28
- Provision for physically handicapped child		3.29	3.34	3.04	- .25	2.60	3.06	2.90	+ .30
- Curriculum for disadvantaged		4.23	4.51	3.56	- .67	3.52	4.13	3.38	- .14
- Provision for pupil welfare needs		4.97	5.07	4.43	- .54	4.46	4.87	4.53	+ .07
FACTOR AVERAGE		3.50	3.81	3.16	- .34	3.23	3.68	3.12	- .11
FACTOR 3: PUPIL-PARENT CHARACTERISTICS									
- Pupil aspiration level		3.50	3.49	3.31	- .19	3.98	3.65	3.62	- .36
- Parent participation in school		2.93	2.95	2.33	- .60	2.41	2.85	2.45	+ .04
- Achievement of pupils		4.00	3.79	3.38	- .62	3.55	3.56	3.72	+ .17
- Supportive attitude of parents		3.71	3.44	3.09	- .62	3.10	3.66	3.50	+ .40
- Type of pupils I teach		3.57	3.40	3.29	- .28	3.10	3.33	3.42	+ .32
- Pupil image of self		3.43	3.54	3.18	- .25	3.02	3.64	3.61	+ .59
- School attendance of pupils		4.38	4.20	4.16	- .22	3.96	4.32	4.27	+ .31
- Overall health level of pupils		3.99	4.07	4.00	+ .01	3.82	4.77	4.33	+ .51
- Motivation of my pupils		4.45	4.45	4.03	- .42	4.12	4.78	4.24	+ .12
- Behavior standards of my pupils		4.05	3.76	3.58	- .47	3.86	3.69	4.08	+ .22
- Previous academic preparation of pupils		3.56	3.56	3.06	- .50	3.40	3.90	3.60	+ .20
- Degree of tardiness		4.03	4.07	3.91	- .12	3.92	3.89	4.03	+ .11
- Pupil discipline		3.89	4.00	3.63	- .26	3.62	3.88	4.13	+ .51
- Provision for pupils' cultural growth		4.52	4.56	3.96	- .56	3.46	4.70	4.07	+ .61
- Provision to challenge able learner		4.25	4.41	3.96	- .29	3.76	4.65	4.46	+ .70
FACTOR AVERAGE		3.88	3.85	3.52	- .36	3.54	3.95	3.84	+ .30
FACTOR 4: CONDITIONS FOR INSTRUCTION									
- Teacher time to plan		3.30	3.25	2.97	- .33	2.93	3.21	2.71	- .22
- Size of my class(es)		4.23	5.14	4.30	+ .07	4.01	5.01	4.72	+ .71
- Time to teach		4.65	4.85	4.36	- .29	4.02	4.58	4.30	+ .28
- Provision for academic remediation		4.40	4.98	4.27	- .13	3.89	4.33	3.61	- .28
FACTOR AVERAGE		4.15	4.56	3.98	- .17	3.71	4.28	3.84	+ .13
FACTOR 5: IMPROVING SCHOOL PROGRAM									
- Provision for visiting teacher services		4.72	4.84	4.36	- .36	5.23	5.22	4.57	- .66
- Provision for supervisory personnel		5.01	5.09	4.75	- .26	5.11	5.26	4.92	- .19
- In-service training		4.89	5.01	4.65	- .24	4.75	5.05	4.56	- .19
- School's provision for pupil health		4.96	5.20	4.08	- .88	4.83	5.68	4.77	- .06
- Adequacy of enrichment activities		4.93	5.26	4.69	- .24	3.95	4.93	4.53	+ .58
- Help in disciplinary problems		4.72	5.00	4.62	- .10	4.32	5.47	5.25	+ .93
- Adequacy of instructional media		4.98	5.38	5.04	+ .06	4.43	5.24	4.93	+ .50
FACTOR AVERAGE		4.89	5.11	4.60	- .29	4.66	5.26	4.79	+ .13
FACTOR 6: LIBRARY RESOURCES									
- Adequacy of school library		3.85	5.98	5.98	+2.13	2.96	5.91	6.25	+3.29
- Availability of professional reading matter		4.80	5.79	5.66	+ .86	4.05	5.78	5.71	+1.66
FACTOR AVERAGE		4.33	5.89	5.82	+1.49	3.51	5.85	5.98	+2.47
FACTOR 7: BOOKS & SUPPLIES									
- Adequacy of supplies		5.33	5.57	5.42	+ .09	4.64	4.65	5.15	+ .51
- Books available to my class		5.01	5.59	5.32	+ .31	4.01	5.01	4.72	+ .71
FACTOR AVERAGE		5.17	5.58	5.37	+ .20	4.33	4.83	4.94	+ .61
FACTOR 8: SCHOOL PLANT									
- Adequacy of school playground		3.51	3.75	3.27	- .24	3.39	3.75	4.14	+ .75
- Adequacy of school building		4.26	4.69	4.29	+ .03	3.78	4.66	4.58	+ .80
FACTOR AVERAGE		3.89	4.22	3.78	- .11	3.59	4.21	4.36	+ .77
TOTAL SURVEY AVERAGE									
		4.26	4.48	4.07	- .19	3.91	4.47	4.24	+ .33

Table 2. Mean Teacher Survey Ratings, SECONDARY LEVEL, by School Group, Year, Factor and Item.

FACTOR Item	(N)	TARGET SCHOOLS				CONTROL SCHOOLS			
		1966 (215)	1967 (190)	1968 (184)	Net Change	1966 (145)	1967 (139)	1968 (127)	Net Change
FACTOR 1: MORALE									
- Staff morale		5.12	4.94	4.21	- .91	5.06	4.73	4.97	- .09
- Professional cooperation among school staff		5.42	5.26	4.69	- .73	5.52	5.12	5.19	- .33
- Teacher/Administration cooperation		5.55	5.40	4.93	- .62	5.30	5.51	5.69	+ .39
- Teaching in my school		5.32	5.38	5.00	- .32	5.21	5.21	5.21	0
- Pupil/Faculty relations		4.99	4.83	4.85	- .14	4.48	4.66	4.83	+ .35
FACTOR AVERAGE		5.28	5.16	4.74	- .54	5.11	5.07	5.18	+ .07
FACTOR 2: SPECIAL EDUCATION NEEDS									
- Provision for emotionally disturbed child		3.08	2.95	2.36	- .72	2.11	2.42	2.58	+ .47
- Provision for socially maladjusted child		3.17	3.15	2.55	- .62	2.10	2.47	2.76	+ .66
- Provision for physically handicapped child		3.35	3.44	3.15	- .20	2.60	2.81	3.04	+ .44
- Curriculum for disadvantaged		4.44	4.35	3.65	- .79	3.27	3.71	3.48	+ .21
- Provision for pupil welfare needs		5.33	5.29	4.17	-1.16	4.76	4.76	4.31	- .45
FACTOR AVERAGE		3.87	3.84	3.18	- .69	2.97	3.23	3.23	+ .26
FACTOR 3: PUPIL-PARENT CHARACTERISTICS									
- Pupil aspiration level		3.15	3.23	3.08	- .07	2.74	3.35	3.37	+ .63
- Parent participation in school		2.00	2.06	1.91	- .09	2.25	2.83	2.23	- .02
- Achievement of pupils		3.67	3.60	3.40	- .27	3.37	3.50	3.85	+ .52
- Supportive attitude of parents		2.95	2.97	2.90	- .05	3.19	3.69	3.45	+ .26
- Type of pupils I teach		3.49	3.38	3.47	- .02	3.25	3.73	3.83	+ .58
- Pupil image of self		3.21	3.11	3.01	- .20	2.73	2.94	3.13	+ .40
- School attendance of pupils		3.15	2.97	2.80	- .35	3.83	4.18	3.76	- .07
- Overall health level of pupils		4.00	4.05	4.01	+ .01	4.16	4.55	4.32	+ .16
- Motivation of my pupils		3.85	3.79	3.50	- .35	4.07	3.81	3.81	- .26
- Behavior standards of pupils		3.83	3.69	3.78	- .05	3.41	3.71	3.77	+ .36
- Previous academic preparation of pupils		3.13	2.95	2.89	- .24	2.95	2.97	3.22	+ .27
- Degree of tardiness		2.96	2.89	2.96	0	3.13	3.55	3.22	+ .09
- Pupil discipline		4.01	3.93	3.84	- .17	3.20	4.07	4.35	+1.15
- Provision for pupil cultural growth		4.29	4.19	3.80	- .49	3.77	4.12	3.90	+ .13
- Provision to challenge able learner		4.39	3.21	4.08	- .91	4.09	4.18	4.20	+ .11
FACTOR AVERAGE		3.47	3.40	3.30	- .17	3.34	3.68	3.63	+ .29
FACTOR 4: CONDITIONS FOR INSTRUCTION									
- Teacher time to plan		4.03	3.98	3.78	- .25	3.77	4.12	3.85	+ .08
- Size of my class(es)		4.34	4.76	4.77	+ .43	3.64	4.17	4.16	+ .62
- Time to teach		4.70	4.69	4.04	- .66	4.51	4.74	3.77	- .74
- Provision for academic remediation		4.23	4.39	4.35	+ .12	3.66	3.88	3.61	- .05
FACTOR AVERAGE		4.33	4.46	4.24	- .09	3.90	4.23	3.85	- .05
FACTOR 5: IMPROVING SCHOOL PROGRAM									
- Provision for visiting teacher services		4.59	5.06	4.45	- .14	4.55	5.04	4.75	+ .20
- Provision for supervisory personnel		5.19	5.08	4.40	- .79	4.64	5.08	4.50	+ .14
- In-service training		4.72	4.99	4.08	- .64	4.82	4.63	4.30	- .57
- Provision for pupil's health		5.61	5.37	4.15	-1.46	4.85	5.20	4.34	- .51
- Adequacy of enrichment activities		4.72	4.56	4.28	- .44	3.86	4.54	4.05	+ .19
- Help in disciplinary problems		5.43	5.42	4.76	- .67	4.52	5.53	5.57	+1.05
- Adequacy of instructional media		5.08	5.01	4.46	- .62	4.71	4.77	4.28	- .43
FACTOR AVERAGE		5.05	5.07	4.37	- .68	4.56	4.97	4.54	- .02
FACTOR 6: LIBRARY RESOURCES									
- Adequacy of school library		4.98	5.07	4.83	- .15	5.55	5.56	5.13	- .42
- Availability of professional reading matter		4.97	5.06	4.69	- .28	6.00	5.30	4.94	-1.06
FACTOR AVERAGE		4.98	5.07	4.76	- .22	5.78	5.43	5.04	- .74
FACTOR 7: BOOKS & SUPPLIES									
- Adequacy of supplies		5.13	5.31	5.15	+ .02	4.94	5.42	4.94	0
- Books available to my class		4.74	4.90	4.60	- .14	4.49	5.07	4.34	- .15
FACTOR AVERAGE		4.94	5.11	4.88	- .06	4.72	5.25	4.64	- .08
FACTOR 8: SCHOOL PLANT									
- Adequacy of school playground		3.72	4.02	3.34	- .38	4.33	4.40	4.49	+ .16
- Adequacy of school building		4.48	4.83	4.30	- .18	4.70	4.74	4.64	- .06
FACTOR AVERAGE		4.10	4.43	3.82	- .28	4.52	4.57	4.57	+ .05
TOTAL SURVEY AVERAGE									
		4.25	4.25	3.89	- .36	4.00	4.26	4.10	+ .10

Secondary Level. Item results and factor averages for secondary level target and control schools are presented in Table 2. The decline in ratings for 1968 discovered among elementary target teachers is also evident in the secondary results. All eight of the 1968 factor means for target teachers are lower than those of both preceding years. By comparison, four factor means for the control group show a net increase, although only one is higher than in 1967.

Despite this factor difference, the total item mean for 1966 and 1967 is identical in secondary level target schools (4.25). In 1968 it decreased .36 to 3.89. The 1968 control school mean was 4.10, compared to 4.00 in 1966 and 4.26 in 1967.

Analysis of variance revealed no significant difference among these six means. Neither school group, year, or interaction showed a significant F ratio.

For ease of comparison, factor means at both the elementary and secondary level are repeated in Table 3. This same table also reports city-wide means combined over all schools: target and non-target, elementary and secondary. Perennially three factors, Morale, Library Resources, and Books and Supplies, have been rated highest at both elementary and secondary levels. Factor 2, Special Education Needs, on the other hand, consistently shows the lowest ratings for each school group. A closer examination of each factor, together with some of the individual item results from Tables 1 and 2 will help to draw additional meaning from the survey.

Morale. Although the means for Factor 1 have regularly been higher than those for most other factors on the survey, a marked decline is visible in the 1968 Morale mean for each school group. At the elementary level, this lower mean follows a 1967 increase among both target and control schools. Secondary means, on the other hand, have shown a steady

decline since 1966. Among elementary level target schools, the net decline from 1966 to 1968 has been .28. At the secondary level the target school mean declined .12 in 1967 and another .42 in 1968. These substantial decreases have brought the Morale means for target schools at both the elementary and secondary levels below the city-wide mean for this factor. They have also increased the target vs. control difference to .23 at the elementary level and .44 at the secondary.

All five items in the factor share in the target school decline for 1968. As shown in Tables 1 and 2, the item "Staff Morale" has the largest net decrease: .47 at the elementary level and .91 at the secondary.

Special Education Needs. Factor 2, which is consistently the lowest rated factor on the survey, shows lower ratings than ever in 1968. Differences from one school group to another are minimal in this most recent year, but target school groups show the greatest declines from 1967 since these means had been considerably higher than those of the control and city-wide groups. The net decrease since 1966 among elementary target schools is .34, and for target schools at the secondary level, .69.

Again, all five items in the factor contributed to the 1968 target school decline at both levels. Significantly, the two items related most directly to the needs of disadvantaged pupils, namely "Curriculum for disadvantaged" and "Provision for pupil welfare needs," shows the greatest decreases. Some of the initial appeal of Education Act services is evidently becoming neutralized. Target school teachers are becoming more aware of a need for continuing improvement of curriculum and increased provision for pupil welfare needs.

Table 3. Teacher Survey Factor Means, by School Group and Year.

			Elementary		Secondary		All Schools
			Target	Control	Target	Control	
Factor 1: Morale	1966		5.15	4.92	5.28	5.11	5.26
	1967		5.24	5.26	5.16	5.07	5.21
	1968		4.87	5.10	4.74	5.18	4.89
Factor 2: Special Education Needs	1966		3.50	3.23	3.87	2.97	3.51
	1967		3.81	3.68	3.84	3.23	3.51
	1968		3.16	3.12	3.18	3.23	3.10
Factor 3: Pupil- Parent Charac- teristics	1966		3.88	3.54	3.47	3.34	4.19
	1967		3.85	3.95	3.40	3.68	4.03
	1968		3.52	3.84	3.30	3.63	3.94
Factor 4: Conditions for Instruction	1966		4.15	3.71	4.33	3.90	4.04
	1967		4.56	4.28	4.46	4.23	4.14
	1968		3.98	3.84	4.24	3.85	3.75
Factor 5: Improving School Program	1966		4.89	4.66	5.05	4.56	4.88
	1967		5.11	5.26	5.07	4.97	4.88
	1968		4.60	4.79	4.37	4.54	4.47
Factor 6: Library Resources	1966		4.33	3.51	4.98	5.78	4.64
	1967		5.89	5.85	5.07	5.43	5.27
	1968		5.82	5.98	4.76	5.04	5.14
Factor 7: Books & Supplies	1966		5.17	4.33	4.94	4.72	5.04
	1967		5.58	4.83	5.11	5.25	5.23
	1968		5.37	4.94	4.88	4.64	4.90
Factor 8: School Plant	1966		3.89	3.59	4.10	4.52	4.21
	1967		4.22	4.21	4.43	4.57	4.36
	1968		3.78	4.36	3.82	4.57	4.15

Pupil-Parent Characteristics. Among target schools at both levels, Factor 3 has shown a gradual decline from 1966 to 1968. Although the factor mean has gone down in both 1967 and 1968, the total decrease is only .36 at the elementary level and .17 at the secondary. By contrast, control school ratings at both levels increased markedly in 1967, surpassing the target school means. Despite a small decline in 1968, these means continue to be higher than those for the respective target school groups.

Only one of the 15 items in this factor, "Overall health level of pupils," has not contributed to the net decline. "Parent participation in school," the lowest rated item in the factor, dropped off sharply among elementary level target schools in 1968. "Provision for cultural growth" shows a rather marked decline at both the elementary and the secondary level.

Conditions for Instruction. Factor 4 shows the most consistent pattern of target school ratings that are higher than those of control schools. Although the means on this factor followed the general survey pattern of decline in 1968, the elementary school target mean remained .14 higher than the control mean, and the secondary school target mean .39 higher than control. The fact that the city-wide mean is the lowest of any group further demonstrates that these survey ratings reflect the impact of Title I services in promoting better teaching conditions in the classroom. The .58 decrease in the elementary target school mean on this factor, although disconcerting, is apparently a function of a large increase in the previous year's rating. The mean for the secondary level target group has been considerably more stable.

At both levels, "Teacher time to plan" is the lowest rated of the four items in this factor. The ratings of secondary level teachers reflect the

availability of far more planning time than at the elementary level. "Time to teach," however, has higher ratings among elementary teachers. This item shows the greatest average decline over both levels.

Improving School Program. Factor 5 follows a pattern very similar to that of the preceding factor. Like most others on the survey, this factor mean increased in 1967 but fell off in 1968. As with Conditions for Instruction, the ratings on the items concerned with improving the school program were lower in 1968 than in the first year of the survey. Unlike Factor 4, however, this factor shows a 1968 mean that is below that for control schools at each level.

The item "Provision for pupil's health" shows the largest net decrease of any item on the survey among target schools at both levels. This item was among the highest ranked in the factor in 1967, but in 1968 it shows the lowest rating at the elementary level and second lowest at the secondary.

Library Resources. Ratings on Factor 6 continue to offer evidence of the impact of Title I resource centers in elementary schools. Comparison of target and control means for this factor must be understood in light of services rendered under Title I. As has been noted, the schools currently identified as controls were actually secondary target schools in which services had been phased out over a period of time. Resource centers provided in these schools remained there, of course, and in 1968 these centers were still staffed with Title I funds. This situation explains the fact that ratings on this factor show a very large increase in both target and control schools in 1967. In 1968 the control rating continued to increase, while that in elementary target schools fell off slightly. This decline seems to be a negative "halo effect," traceable mostly to lower staff morale. The same is true of the drop in secondary level target and control

school ratings. No Title I effort has been expended to improve secondary school libraries because it was felt that existing libraries were reasonably adequate. The fact remains that, with some consistency, Factor 6 shows higher overall ratings than any other on the survey.

From 1966 to 1968, both items in this factor show very high net gains for elementary target and control schools. "Adequacy of school library" has increased 2.13 in target elementary schools and 3.29 in control schools at the elementary level. By contrast, at the secondary level both items show net decreases, with the control school rating for "Availability of professional reading matter" dropping off most sharply (-1.06).

Books and Supplies. Undoubtedly, Factor 7 shares in the impact of the resource centers. Except for Library Resources, no other factor in the survey shows higher means for the elementary target school group. It should be noted, however, that the elementary control means on this factor run somewhat lower, suggesting that other Title I physical provisions have also played an important part in establishing the high ratings. The mean for this factor decreased in target schools in 1968: from 5.58 to 5.37 at the elementary level, and from 5.11 to 4.88 at the secondary level. The elementary control school rating shows a gain, while that at the secondary level fell off rather sharply. Factor 7 is one of two factors on the survey where target ratings at both the elementary and secondary level were higher than control ratings in 1968.

In general, teachers appear to be more satisfied with the provision of supplies than of books needed for classroom instruction. The rating on the item "Adequacy of supplies" has been consistently higher than that given to "Books available to my class." Over the three years the pattern of item ratings, as in most other factors, has been an increase in 1967 and a decline in 1968. The sole exception to this is the elementary control

school ratings on the supplies item, which has increased each year, thereby accounting for the steady increase in the factor mean among this group of teachers.

School Plant. Factor 8 has shown a similar steady increase among elementary control schools. Target school ratings at both levels, on the other hand, follow the general pattern of increase in 1967 and decline in 1968. Over the two-year period the net decrease is .11 among elementary target schools and .28 at the secondary level. It is important to note that little Title I money has been spent on improvement of school playgrounds or buildings.

At both levels, target school teachers are obviously less satisfied with the playgrounds than with the building units themselves. For both "Adequacy of school playground" and "Adequacy of school building," control school ratings at both levels are higher than target school ratings in 1968.

New Items. Eight items appeared on the Teacher Survey for the first time in 1968. Ratings given these items by teachers in elementary and secondary target and control schools are reported, along with city-wide means, in Table 4. Of the eight new items, "Satisfaction of my job" has the highest overall rating. "The special education program," however, is rated even higher in both target and control schools at the secondary level. The lowest single rating is for "Counseling and psychological services" among elementary target schools. It should be noted that no elementary counselors were provided in target schools in 1967-68. At least one elementary control school, on the other hand, had a counselor under a special program.

At the secondary level both this latter item and "Teacher's voice in policy making" show substantial differences between target and control schools favoring the control group. Over all eight items, in fact, control

Table 4. Mean 1968 Teacher Survey Ratings on Eight New Items, by School Group.

	Elementary		Secondary		All Schools
	Target	Control	Target	Control	
Curriculum for low achievers	3.48	3.36	3.98	3.74	3.20
Curriculum bulletins	4.61	4.72	4.15	4.44	4.47
Counseling and psychological services	2.99	3.45	3.69	4.40	3.59
Teachers' voice in policy making	3.73	3.75	3.59	4.26	3.66
The special education program	4.92	4.72	5.36	5.20	4.41
Satisfaction of my job	5.13	5.36	5.12	5.13	5.10
The use made of federal funds	4.51	4.59	4.71	4.06	3.90
This survey questionnaire	4.04	3.91	3.47	3.56	3.62

ratings tend to be higher than those of target school teachers. The two items on which the reverse is true at both elementary and secondary levels are "Curriculum for low achievers" and "The special education program."

Conclusions

This discussion of the results of the 1968 Teacher Survey leads to several conclusions:

1. Elementary target school teachers judged the school-related concepts contained in the Teacher Survey less favorably in 1968 than in 1967. The significant difference between target and control changes suggests that this lower rating is linked to the Title I program. Conceivably, it is a function of decreasing enthusiasm as teachers grow more accustomed to the benefits derived by target schools.
2. At the secondary level, ratings also showed a decline, but there is no evidence to link this phenomenon to the Title I program. Some other condition, probably a general decline in staff morale, seems to account for the lower ratings given not only by target teachers but also by those in control schools and throughout the city.
3. Factor averages among school groups over the three-year period permit several generalizations:
 - a. Morale, Library Resources, and Books and Supplies continue to be the highest rated factors in the survey, while Special Education Needs is the lowest.
 - b. At least three of the factors show comparative averages that relate clearly to Title I, ESEA. Higher target than control school ratings on Conditions for Instruction and on Books and Supplies reflect Title I impact. The very high ratings among both target and control teachers on Library Resources is also traceable to Title I in that resource centers were provided in both categories of schools.
 - c. Although the perennially low ratings on Special Education Needs fell off on a city-wide basis in 1968, target school teachers expressed the greatest increase in dissatisfaction.
4. Target ratings on several items particularly related to the special needs of disadvantaged pupils indicate an awareness of teachers to a continuing need to adapt the curriculum and otherwise to help pupils find success in their school work.

Summary

The Survey of Teacher Opinions, an instrument on which teachers express their judgments of school-related concepts on a seven-point rating scale, was administered for the third consecutive year in May, 1968. Although all teachers in the system were surveyed, the chief interest in this report was in changes over the three-year period since the initiation of Title I in the ratings of teachers in target vs. control schools. Total survey mean ratings for these two groups in each of the three years were analyzed separately at the elementary and the secondary level to determine significance of difference.

This analysis revealed that ratings by elementary target school teachers had declined significantly as compared to elementary control ratings. At the secondary level, the target ratings were also more negative, but the difference was not statistically significant. The initially strong positive effect of Education Act services is evidently becoming neutralized with time. Teachers are reflecting an awareness that efforts still must be intensified to strengthen many phases of the school program in order to do an effective job of educating the disadvantaged pupil.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY, 1968

Background

The rationale for the Teacher Survey as reported in the preceding chapter also justifies an attempt to obtain judgments from school administrators. Those charged with the responsibility for the smooth functioning of school operations are in an advantageous position to appraise the quality of the educational process. The perspective of school building administrators is generally more thorough than that of teachers. At the same time, their concern with everyday functioning of their schools puts them in a better position to evaluate many of the specific facets of the educational program than personnel with system-wide responsibility.

For these reasons a Survey of Administrator Opinions was constructed in 1966 to parallel the Survey of Teacher Opinions. This separate instrument was built because of the difference in perspective of the two groups. This enabled items that were relevant to teachers but not to administrators to be replaced by more pertinent items for administrator reaction. Nevertheless, there remained considerable similarity in the two surveys.

Description of Survey

Like the Teacher Survey, the Survey of Administrator Opinions depends upon the concept of the semantic differential, explained in the preceding chapter. Forty-eight items are included, each of which consists of a brief phrase describing some aspect of the schools' program. Responses take the form of a rating on a seven-point scale from 1 (poor) to 7 (good). Only minor changes have been made in the Administrator Survey since the beginning of the Title I program. Each year the instrument has been

administered to school principals, assistant principals, and administrative aides or interns throughout the system.

Method of Analysis

Because the respondents are relatively few in number, no factor analysis has been conducted on the Administrator Survey. Rather, the assumption was made that the factor structure would parallel that of the Survey of Teacher Opinions, and different items were placed into factors rationally, rather than empirically.

Comparison of survey results over the three year period is between target school administrators and the total city-wide group. The small number of respondents makes the use of a group of control school administrators impractical. Similarly, it is not feasible to recompute item means to yield a target vs. non-target comparison.

Results

Table 5 compares the survey ratings given by approximately 40 administrators in target schools with those by all administrators in the system. Means are reported for each of the three years in which this survey has been administered. Items are grouped and averaged by factor.

In each of the three years the city-wide mean rating over all items has been higher than that for the target school group. In 1968 the difference is .11. The 4.63 mean for target school administrators is .21 below the comparable 1967 mean. Nevertheless, target school administrators' ratings are higher than those of the total group on four of the eight factors in the 1968 survey. Accounting for most of the difference favoring the city-wide ratings is Factor 3, Pupil-Parent Characteristics, which includes 17 items. To derive more meaning from the data in Table 5, each factor should be examined separately and noteworthy changes in items should be specified.

Table 5. Mean Administrator Survey Ratings, by School Group, Year, Factor and Item.

FACTOR Item	TARGET SCHOOLS				CITY-WIDE			
	(N)	1966 (32)	1967 (48)	1968 (39) Net Change	1966 (160)	1967 (186)	1968 (168) Net Change	
FACTOR 1: MORALE								
- Staff morale.		5.19	5.46	4.97 - .22	5.63	5.48	5.15 - .48	
- Professional cooperation among staff.		5.59	5.77	5.21 - .38	5.81	5.80	5.39 - .42	
- Teacher-Administration cooperation.		5.88	6.15	5.62 - .26	5.99	6.00	5.82 - .07	
- Pupil-Faculty relations.		5.39	5.50	5.08 - .31	5.68	5.57	5.32 - .34	
- School's attempt to reach parents.		5.09	5.73	5.31 + .22	5.55	5.71	5.46 - .09	
- Challenge of my position.		6.09	6.19	5.95 - .16	6.09	6.19	5.95 - .14	
- Extent of teacher absenteeism.		4.88	4.71	4.82 - .06	5.13	4.82	4.71 - .42	
FACTOR AVERAGE		5.44	5.64	5.28 - .16	5.70	5.65	5.40 - .30	
FACTOR 2: SPECIAL EDUCATION NEEDS								
- Provision for emotionally-disturbed.		1.88	3.15	3.03 +1.15	2.06	2.59	2.31 + .25	
- Provision for socially-maladjusted.		2.16	2.63	3.50 +1.34	2.26	3.03	2.73 + .47	
- Provision for physically-handicapped.		3.59	3.73	3.55 - .04	3.24	3.69	3.59 + .35	
- Present curriculum for disadvantaged.		3.52	4.56	4.23 + .71	3.33	3.93	3.71 + .38	
FACTOR AVERAGE		2.79	3.52	3.58 + .79	2.72	3.31	3.09 + .37	
FACTOR 3: PUPIL-PARENT CHARACTERISTICS								
- Pupil aspiration level.		3.10	4.17	3.97 + .87	4.06	4.53	4.38 + .32	
- Parent participation in school.		2.72	3.23	3.36 + .64	3.36	4.13	5.95 +2.09	
- Pupil achievement.		3.78	4.17	4.21 + .43	4.41	4.66	4.52 + .11	
- Parent involvement.		3.63	3.61	3.50 - .13	4.22	4.21	4.04 - .18	
- Supportive attitude of parents.		4.19	4.52	4.26 + .07	4.93	4.93	4.91 - .02	
- The type of pupils in my school.		3.41	3.83	4.24 + .83	4.45	4.48	4.72 + .27	
- Pupil image of self.		3.25	3.89	3.86 + .61	4.15	4.47	4.27 + .12	
- Pupil attendance.		3.91	4.23	4.24 + .33	4.87	4.57	4.52 - .35	
- Overall health level of pupils.		3.59	4.25	4.41 + .82	4.83	4.89	5.02 + .19	
- Motivation of pupils.		3.97	4.48	4.16 + .19	4.52	4.75	4.56 + .04	
- Behavior standards of pupils.		4.53	4.17	4.79 + .26	5.07	4.61	4.73 - .30	
- Previous academic preparation of pupils.		3.06	3.81	3.74 + .68	3.94	4.14	4.14 + .24	
- Pupil acquaintance with total community.		3.34	4.27	4.05 + .71	3.95	4.35	4.52 + .57	
- Degree of pupil tardiness.		3.59	3.78	4.10 + .51	4.41	4.29	4.14 - .27	
- Pupil discipline.		5.09	4.89	4.78 - .31	5.25	5.07	4.91 - .34	
- Provision for pupils' cultural growth.		4.13	5.00	5.18 +1.05	4.46	5.09	4.90 + .44	
- Provision to challenge able learner.		4.25	4.67	4.23 - .02	4.64	5.08	4.83 + .19	
FACTOR AVERAGE		3.58	4.03	4.18 + .60	4.50	4.62	4.66 + .16	
FACTOR 4: CONDITIONS FOR INSTRUCTION								
- Teacher time to plan.		4.06	4.70	4.54 + .48	4.40	4.66	4.38 - .02	
- Time for teachers to teach.		5.19	5.58	5.26 + .07	5.42	5.59	5.18 - .24	
- Time and place for pupils to study.		3.48	4.56	4.63 +1.15	3.72	4.25	4.15 + .43	
- Provision for academic remediation.		3.94	5.56	4.89 + .95	3.62	4.54	4.09 + .47	
- Teacher-pupil ratio.		4.53	5.71	5.26 + .73	4.34	5.15	4.85 + .51	
FACTOR AVERAGE		4.24	5.22	4.92 + .68	4.45	4.99	4.63 + .18	
FACTOR 5: IMPROVING SCHOOL PROGRAM								
- Provision for visiting teacher services.		4.38	5.23	4.77 + .39	4.82	5.25	5.10 + .28	
- Provision for supervisory personnel.		4.56	5.25	5.14 + .58	5.00	5.37	5.13 + .13	
- Adequacy of in-service training.		4.52	5.29	4.79 + .27	4.73	5.08	4.64 - .09	
- Field trip opportunities.		4.47	5.96	4.67 + .20	4.66	5.45	5.04 + .38	
- School's provision for pupil health.		4.25	5.30	4.21 - .04	4.48	4.82	4.28 - .20	
- Adequacy of enrichment activities.		4.16	5.48	5.34 +1.18	4.36	5.06	4.92 + .56	
FACTOR AVERAGE		4.39	5.42	4.82 + .43	4.68	5.12	4.81 + .13	
FACTOR 6: LIBRARY RESOURCES								
- Adequacy of school library.		3.44	6.25	6.10 +2.66	3.72	5.26	5.36 +1.64	
- Availability of prof. reading matter.		4.34	5.94	5.67 +1.33	4.70	5.70	5.57 + .97	
FACTOR AVERAGE		3.89	6.10	5.89 +2.00	4.21	5.48	5.47 +1.26	
FACTOR 7: BOOKS AND SUPPLIES								
- Adequacy of supplies.		5.59	6.13	5.97 + .38	5.70	6.04	5.95 + .25	
- Availability of books.		5.41	6.17	5.62 + .21	5.39	5.97	5.79 + .40	
FACTOR AVERAGE		5.50	6.15	5.80 + .30	5.55	6.01	5.87 + .32	
FACTOR 8: SCHOOL PLANT								
- Adequacy of school playground.		3.50	4.09	3.97 + .47	4.18	4.46	4.50 + .32	
- Adequacy of school building.		4.81	5.39	5.03 + .22	4.47	4.73	4.85 + .38	
- Adequacy of parking facilities.		4.94	5.56	4.31 - .63	4.86	5.12	4.82 - .04	
- Adequacy of pupil lunchroom facilities.		4.22	5.06	4.82 + .60	4.21	4.81	4.77 + .56	
- Adequacy of faculty lunchroom facilities.		4.09	4.56	4.67 + .58	4.39	4.85	4.92 + .53	
FACTOR AVERAGE		4.31	4.93	4.56 + .25	4.42	4.79	4.77 + .35	
TOTAL SURVEY AVERAGE								
		4.15	4.84	4.63 + .48	4.54	4.63	4.74 + .20	

Morale. Factor 1 shows a .12 difference favoring the city-wide ratings in 1968. In the previous year, target and city-wide mean ratings on this factor were almost identical, while in 1966 the city-wide average was .26 higher than that for the target schools. Six of the seven items in the factor show the city-wide ratings to be higher than those of target administrators in 1968. The greatest difference is on the item "Pupil-Faculty Relations," which the total group of administrators rated .24 higher than the target group.

Special Education Needs. Factor 2, the lowest rated factor on the survey, shows a higher mean for target administrators than for the city-wide group in each of the three years. In 1966 this difference was only .07. It increased to .21 in 1967 and to .49 in 1968. Three of the four items had higher ratings among target school administrators, and all of these differences exceed .50. Target school administrators are much more satisfied with provisions for the socially-maladjusted and the emotionally disturbed child than the average administrator over the city.

Pupil-Parent Characteristics. Factor 3 is the factor on which ratings of target administrators are farthest below those of the city-wide group. In 1968 target school administrators gave a mean rating of 4.18 on the 17 items in this factor, while the city-wide average was 4.66. This .48 difference, however, is less than the difference in 1967 (.59) and in 1966 (.92). In each of the two previous years, all 17-items in this factor showed ratings favoring the city-wide group. In 1968, however, two items, "Behavior standards of pupils" and "Provision for pupil's cultural growth," show slightly higher ratings by target administrators. Although no pattern is discernible in terms of those items that increased and decreased among target administrators, it is interesting to note that the

behavior standards item showed a rather dramatic increase of .62. The cultural growth item, meanwhile, rose .18. These 1968 ratings make these two items the highest rated in this factor.

Conditions for Instruction. Factor 4 shows 1968 target ratings to be higher than those for the city-wide group. Target school administrators gave higher ratings than all administrators in the city to all five items in that group. The greatest difference (.80) is on the item "Provision for academic remediation." It is worthy of notice, however, that the mean for this factor declined .30 among target administrators in 1968. Four of the five items show lower ratings in the most recent year. Although the overall decline for this factor is lower among target schools than over the city, it does suggest that administrators are somewhat less satisfied with the improvements in conditions for instruction made possible through the Title I program. The .67 decline in the academic remediation item is a prime example.

Improving School Program. Factor 5 shows a 4.82 mean for target administrators in 1968, compared with 4.81 for all administrators in the city. This represents a decline from the preceding year for both groups, but the decrease is appreciably larger among target schools. Target school ratings fell sharply on two items, "School's provision for pupil health" and "Field trip opportunities." This latter item shows the greatest 1968 difference in favor of the city-wide group. "Adequacy of enrichment activities," on the other hand, shows a 5.34 rating for the target group and 4.92 city-wide.

Library Resources. Factor 6 also has a higher target school than city-wide average. However, this difference also is smaller than in the preceding year. The city-wide mean for this factor is almost identical over the two years, while that for the target group declined .21, with both items sharing in the decrease.

Books and Supplies. Factor 7 is one of two factors on the survey in which target ratings were higher than city-wide in 1967 but lower in 1968. This mean decreased .35 among target administrators, while the city-wide average declined only .14.

School Plant. Factor 8 shows a similar pattern, with the target school mean declining .37 and the city-wide average .02. Most of this change is the function of the item "Adequacy of parking facilities," which declined 1.25 among target administrators.

Conclusions

This review of the results of the 1968 Survey of Administrator Opinions leads to three fundamental conclusions:

1. After a substantial increase in 1967, survey ratings by target school administrators declined in 1968. Despite this decrease, however, they remained higher on the average than for the base-line (1966) year.
2. Target school administrators continued to relate concepts related to the educational program lower than the city-wide administrators. The greatest difference favoring the city-wide group was in the area of pupil-parent characteristics. Morale items also have shown ~~perennially lower ratings for the target~~ group. Survey items related to books and supplies and to school plant showed a higher average among school administrators in 1967, but declined in 1968 to a point lower than the city-wide mean for these factors.
3. Four survey factors showed higher 1968 means for the target group than city-wide: Special Education Needs, Conditions for Instruction, Improving School Program, and Library Resources.

Summary

In 1968 the Survey of Administrator Opinions was given for the third time to school principals, assistant principals, and administrative interns throughout the school system. Administrators' judgments are seen as a valuable indicator of strengths and weaknesses in the educational program and related characteristics, and thus as a means of assessing the gross effects of such special educational efforts as the Title I program.

Mean item ratings within each of eight factors were compared for target and city-wide groups over each of the three survey years. Chief emphasis, of course, was on the 1968 ratings by target school administrators. The total survey mean for this group declined .21 from the 1967 peak. In general, target school administrators continued to rate survey items lower than the city-wide group. Items related to pupil-parent characteristics showed greatest differences in favor of the city-wide group. Four factors--Special Education Needs, Conditions for Instruction, Improving School Program, and Library Resources--showed higher 1968 ratings among the target school group.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF STUDENT SURVEY, 1968

Background

Pupil attitudes are considered one of the most important, but least measurable elements in education. How the pupil feels about himself, about other persons involved with him in the processes of learning and living and, in fact, about the processes themselves unquestionably has a strong effect on what he gets out of an educational program. This is an especially vital consideration among the disadvantaged, where education is likely to be held in low esteem, and negative attitudes are often developed early and nurtured liberally through negative experiences.

In evaluating educational programs established to benefit such disadvantaged pupils, attitude measurement has posed a cardinal dilemma. Where program objectives have taken the importance of coping with attitudes into consideration, they have typically been stated either in vague terms or in the form of expected behaviors that require a broad inferential leap in the evaluation of attitudes. Meanwhile, educational measurement specialists, as well as those in related behavioral sciences, have continued their attempts to find better measurement tools.

At the outset of the Title I program in Cincinnati, a survey of student attitudes was devised for use in program evaluation. Its utility was seen in the light of assessing broad program effects rather than outcomes of specific services. The survey was first administered at the conclusion of the 1965-66 school year, the first year under Title I.

Description of Survey

In the hope of increasing the validity of the instrument, the Student Survey was made anonymous. The original survey included 20 items.

In 1967 it was modified and enlarged to 25 items. The survey again was given at the end of the academic year. In each of the first two years, administration of the survey was concentrated in primary target, secondary target, and control schools. All pupils enrolled in grades four through eleven in these schools were asked to complete the survey.

For the 1967-68 program evaluation, the survey instrument used in the previous year was kept intact. The plan for administration, however, was modified, so that the survey would encompass representative grades from all schools in the system. Grades 6, 9, and 12 were selected as the product measurement years for the intermediate, junior high school, and senior high school grades.

Each of the items on the Student Survey expresses an opinion or attitude in question form. The respondent is asked to answer each question either yes or no. Although some differences in professional judgment are possible, most of the items have an answer that is clearly desirable from the educator's viewpoint.

Method of Analysis

The results of the 1967 survey, like those of the preceding year, were factor analyzed. This analysis suggested a two-factor constellation, with one factor associated primarily with student attitude toward school itself and the other concerned with his feelings about his likelihood of success. The two factors were thus labeled Attitude Toward School and Academic Confidence.

The factor analysis also established the keying of the survey. With the exception of five items that correlated negatively with others in their factor groupings, the affirmative response is considered favorable.

Item and factor means were computed for each grade included in the survey by school groupings. Primary interest was in changes in the percentage of students giving the desired response. Because the 1968 instrument was identical to that of 1967, the basic comparisons used the data from these two years. Prior to 1968, however, the survey had not been given to twelfth grade students nor to any others outside the target and control groups. Thus, comparisons were possible only for grades 6 and 9, and only for target and control groupings. As with the Teacher Survey, the eight elementary level, secondary target schools ranking highest in economic deprivation, along with the three secondary level, secondary target schools, were identified as the control or comparison group.

Analysis of covariance was used to compare 1968 target and control results separately for grade 6 and grade 9. Through covariance analysis, differences which existed between the two groups in 1967 were controlled statistically. In effect, then, the analysis indicates whether there was a significant difference between the two groups in the changes that occurred in the results from one year to the next.

In addition to this basic systematic analysis, 1968 target school results were compared with those for the baseline year, 1966. Finally, the 1968 city-wide results were used for comparison purposes. These were especially important for grade 12 because the survey had not been administered to twelfth graders in the previous years.

Results

Table 6 compares item percentages of favorable response by sixth graders in target and control schools in 1967 and 1968. Overall, the latter year showed relatively fewer target sixth graders giving the desired answers to the 25 items. The mean percentage of favorable response in target schools decreased from 69.4 per cent in 1967 to 68.4 per cent in

1968. By contrast, the control school sixth grade group showed a slight increase. In 1967 the mean percentage for this group was 69.4 per cent, the same as for the target school sixth graders. In 1968, however, this mean increased to 70.7 per cent. In terms of the total survey, then, favorable responses of target school sixth graders decreased an average of 1.0 per cent per item, while those for control schools increased an average of 1.3 per cent. Analysis of covariance showed this difference to be significant at the .05 level ($F=4.21$; $d.f.=1,47$).

Ninth grade student responses are reported in Table 7. Target school ninth graders also responded less favorably in 1968 than 1967. At this level, however, the percentage of decrease was less than for the control group. Target school favorable responses decreased 2.1 per cent, from 62.9 per cent to 60.8 per cent, while those for control schools decreased 2.6 per cent, from 61.3 per cent to 58.7 per cent. This difference in percentage of change is not significant, however.

A different comparison technique is used in Table 8. Here, 1968 target school percentages for grades 6, 9, and 12 are compared with the appropriate city-wide percentages. In both school groups, sixth graders gave the highest percentage of affirmative response, and ninth graders, the lowest. At sixth-grade level the city-wide percentage (68.8%) is slightly higher than that for target schools (68.4%). Ninth grade target school response, on the other hand, exceeds the city-wide percentage by 1.5 per cent. A similar difference in favor of target school pupils is seen at the twelfth-grade level.

For a more thorough understanding of the data contained in Tables 6, 7, and 8, it is helpful to consider the item percentages in clusters according to the factor analysis performed on the 1967 results. Two factors, Attitude Toward School and Academic Confidence, will be discussed.

Table 6. Percentages of Favorable Response to Student Survey, SIXTH GRADE, by School Group, Year, Factor, and Item.

FACTOR Item	(N)	TARGET SCHOOLS			CONTROL SCHOOLS		
		1967 (907)	1968 (919)	1968- 1967	1967 (533)	1968 (586)	1968- 1967
FACTOR 1: ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL							
- Do you like school?		36.9%	79.0%	- 7.9%	81.2%	84.1%	+ 2.9%
- Do you read books from a library?		88.3	87.4	- .9	91.5	87.2	- 4.3
- Do you like your school?		73.5	67.4	- 6.1	67.3	69.1	+ 1.8
- Do you get along better outside of school than in school?		46.6	43.0	- 3.3	47.8	48.8	+ 1.0
- Would you like to spend more time at school?		39.7	32.2	- 7.5	36.4	36.2	- .2
- Do you look forward to coming to school each morning?		80.2	75.8	- 4.4	77.6	79.0	+ 1.4
- Do you talk about school at home?		81.1	76.5	- 4.6	80.5	79.7	- .8
- Do you think your teachers usually expect too much of you?		58.2	56.8	- 1.4	65.3	64.1	- 1.2
- Are your lowest grades usually your teacher's fault?		84.9	81.4	- 3.5	83.0	87.4	+ 4.4
FACTOR AVERAGE		71.0	66.6	- 4.4	70.1	70.6	+ .5
FACTOR 2: ACADEMIC CONFIDENCE							
- Do you need more help from your teacher?		30.5	34.1	+ 3.6	29.3	30.4	+ 1.1
- Are you satisfied with the grades on your report card?		39.3	45.7	+ 6.4	50.5	48.5	- 2.0
- Do you worry about your schoolwork?		17.9	20.1	+ 2.2	23.7	15.0	- 8.7
- Are you doing better in your schoolwork this year?		67.6	71.0	+ 2.4	74.7	71.6	- 3.1
- Do you think you will graduate from high school?		88.6	87.4	- 1.2	87.0	92.8	+ 5.8
- Do your teachers think you are doing well in your schoolwork?		55.2	62.4	+ 7.2	59.1	57.8	- 1.3
- Do your parents think you are doing well in your schoolwork?		67.2	69.2	+ 2.0	72.5	70.4	- 2.1
FACTOR AVERAGE		52.3	55.7	+ 3.4	56.7	55.2	- 1.5
OTHER ITEMS							
- Do you enjoy field trips?		97.8	94.6	- 3.2	93.3	95.9	+ 2.6
- Do field trips help you in schoolwork?		74.8	72.0	- 2.8	70.9	75.7	+ 4.8
- Has someone from home ever talked to your teachers?		76.7	76.7	0	76.9	82.3	+ 5.4
- Do you get praise at home for good schoolwork?		78.9	80.4	+ 4.5	75.9	81.5	+ 5.6
- Do you hope to go to college?		91.6	89.7	- 1.9	89.7	92.7	+ 3.0
- Do you talk at home about what kind of job or career you will have after you are out of school?		86.9	84.3	- 2.6	84.6	88.9	+ 4.3
- Do you read more than is required by your schoolwork?		55.3	56.4	+ 1.1	49.5	57.9	+ 8.4
- Do you think you could do well in any school subject if you studied hard enough?		96.3	96.6	+ .3	96.8	97.1	+ .3
- Do you think you could do well in any kind of job you choose?		72.0	71.1	- .9	70.7	72.7	+ 2.0
AVERAGE		81.1	80.2	- .9	78.7	82.7	+ 4.0
TOTAL SURVEY AVERAGE							
		69.4	68.4	- 1.0	69.4	70.7	+ 1.3

Table 7. Percentages of Favorable Response to Student Survey, NINTH GRADE, by School Group, Year, Factor, and Item.

FACTOR Item	(N)	TARGET SCHOOLS			CONTROL SCHOOLS		
		1967 (640)	1968 (550)	1968- 1967	1967 (792)	1968 (747)	1968- 1967
FACTOR 1: ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL							
- Do you like school?		78.3%	76.3%	- 2.0%	78.9%	68.1%	-10.9%
- Do you read books from a library?		62.5	55.9	- 6.6	60.4	55.6	- 4.8
- Do you like your school?		65.1	60.2	- 4.9	63.2	51.1	-12.1
- Do you get along better outside of school than in school?		43.6	35.1	- 8.5	24.1	32.6	+ 6.5
- Would you like to spend more time at school?		15.5	14.7	- .8	12.7	10.9	- 1.8
- Do you look forward to coming to school each morning?		60.5	62.3	+ 1.8	62.9	55.3	- 7.6
- Do you talk about school at home?		72.6	70.3	- 2.3	74.6	67.6	- 7.0
- Do you think your teachers usually expect too much of you?		54.0	58.1	+ 4.1	50.0	51.2	+ 1.2
- Are your lowest grades usually your teacher's fault?		80.7	81.6	+ .9	78.6	78.0	- .6
FACTOR AVERAGE							
		59.2	57.2	- 2.0	56.2	52.3	- 3.9
FACTOR 2: ACADEMIC CONFIDENCE							
- Do you need more help from your teacher?		35.8	39.4	+ 3.6	38.5	41.7	+ 3.2
- Are you satisfied with the grades on your report card?		36.9	33.0	- 3.9	33.5	34.1	+ .6
- Do you worry about your schoolwork?		27.4	24.5	- 2.9	24.1	26.6	+ 2.5
- Are you doing better in your schoolwork this year?		60.5	59.0	- 1.5	59.6	55.7	- 3.9
- Do you think you will graduate from high school?		95.3	91.8	- 3.5	96.0	95.0	- 1.0
- Do your teachers think you are doing well in your schoolwork?		60.1	51.9	- 8.2	56.1	54.3	- 1.8
- Do your parents think you are doing well in your schoolwork?		63.0	56.5	- 6.5	59.8	57.5	- 2.3
FACTOR AVERAGE							
		54.1	50.9	- 3.2	52.5	52.1	- .4
OTHER ITEMS							
- Do you enjoy field trips?		95.3	95.3	0	92.8	89.1	- 3.7
- Do field trips help you in schoolwork?		78.5	74.8	- 3.7	71.8	59.1	-12.7
- Has someone from home ever talked to your teachers?		63.9	62.3	- 1.6	66.3	66.2	- .1
- Do you get praise at home for good schoolwork?		62.5	61.0	- 1.5	64.3	64.1	- .2
- Do you hope to go to college?		69.2	70.1	+ .9	74.7	72.6	- 2.1
- Do you talk at home about what kind of job or career you will have after you are out of school?		84.1	84.7	+ .6	85.2	83.9	- 1.3
- Do you read more than is required by your schoolwork?		38.4	31.9	- 6.5	36.8	29.9	- 6.9
- Do you think you could do well in any school subject if you studied hard enough?		92.6	91.8	- .8	91.0	88.3	- 2.7
- Do you think you could do well in any kind of job you choose?		75.6	77.3	+ 1.7	77.8	77.8	0
AVERAGE							
		73.3	72.1	- 1.2	73.4	70.1	- 3.3
TOTAL SURVEY AVERAGE							
		62.9	60.8	- 2.1	61.3	58.7	- 2.6

Table 8. Percentages of 1968 Target School Favorable Response to Student Survey Compared to City-Wide Percentages, by Grade, Factor, and Item.

FACTOR Item	GRADE 6 (N) (919) (5847)		GRADE 9 Tar- get (550) City Wide (4530)		GRADE 12 Tar- get (202) City Wide (2806)	
FACTOR 1: ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL						
- Do you like school?	79.0%	79.8%	76.3%	67.5%	82.6%	69.4%
- Do you read books from a library?	87.4	88.0	55.9	59.7	58.4	61.6
- Do you like your school?	67.4	69.0	60.2	62.9	89.6	71.5
- Do you get along better outside of school than in school?	43.0	46.0	35.1	37.3	58.8	46.6
- Would you like to spend more time at school?	32.2	25.4	14.7	9.0	12.5	8.3
- Do you look forward to coming to school each morning?	75.8	69.2	62.3	42.6	62.2	31.6
- Do you talk about school at home?	76.5	81.9	70.3	73.1	74.1	75.0
- Do you think your teachers usually expect too much of you?	56.8	66.3	58.1	55.7	57.7	64.5
- Are your lowest grades usually your teacher's fault?	81.4	87.3	81.6	79.0	84.7	84.8
FACTOR AVERAGE	66.6	68.1	57.2	54.1	64.5	57.0
FACTOR 2: ACADEMIC CONFIDENCE						
- Do you need more help from your teacher?	34.1	42.8	39.4	47.2	31.2	57.8
- Are you satisfied with the grades on your report card?	45.7	43.9	33.0	33.7	27.2	37.9
- Do you worry about your schoolwork?	20.1	21.5	24.5	27.0	29.4	30.9
- Are you doing better in your schoolwork this year?	71.0	68.1	59.0	56.4	61.7	61.1
- Do you think you will graduate from high school?	87.4	91.1	91.8	94.3	96.5	97.4
- Do your teachers think you are doing well in your schoolwork?	62.4	58.6	51.9	52.8	52.7	57.6
- Do your parents think you are doing well in your schoolwork?	69.2	67.0	56.5	54.5	65.4	60.6
FACTOR AVERAGE	55.7	56.1	50.9	52.3	52.0	59.0
OTHER ITEMS						
- Do you enjoy field trips?	94.6	95.8	95.3	89.3	93.0	82.7
- Do field trips help you in schoolwork?	72.0	72.9	74.8	66.2	67.2	58.5
- Has someone from home ever talked to your teachers?	76.7	79.8	62.3	59.5	55.0	54.2
- Do you get praise at home for good schoolwork?	80.4	78.9	61.0	65.6	70.3	67.7
- Do you hope to go to college?	89.7	88.9	70.1	71.5	58.9	68.9
- Do you talk at home about what kind of job or career you will have after you are out of school?	84.3	83.0	84.7	81.8	90.1	89.8
- Do you read more than is required by your schoolwork?	56.4	54.2	31.9	40.9	41.8	51.4
- Do you think you could do well in any school subject if you studied hard enough?	96.6	94.5	91.8	87.1	90.1	84.2
- Do you think you could do well in any kind of job you choose?	71.1	65.7	77.3	68.5	86.6	72.5
AVERAGE	80.2	79.3	72.1	70.0	72.6	70.0
TOTAL SURVEY AVERAGE	68.4	68.8	60.8	59.3	63.9	62.3

Other items that did not fit into either of the factors because of low inter-correlations will be examined separately, even though most of these tended to show a positive vector in the direction of attitude toward school.

Attitude Toward School. In Factor 1 are clustered nine items that most strongly reflect the pupil's attitude toward school. Understandably, the mean percentage for the various groups on this factor paralleled rather closely the results of the total survey. For this factor, however, the sharpest drop is among sixth graders in target schools, where all items decreased from 1967 to 1968. Three closely related items, "Do you like school?" "Do you like your school?" and "Would you like to spend more time at school?", showed a decline of 6 per cent or more. On the latter two items, the presence of a trend is suggested in that the percentage of favorable response has decreased each of the two years. In spite of this, the sixth grade target school response to "Would you like to spend more time at school?" remained substantially higher than the city-wide percentage for sixth graders (25.4%).

The smaller decrease in the Attitude Toward School factor among target school ninth graders is attributable to the fact that three items show an increase from 1967 to 1968. These items are: "Do you look forward to coming to school each morning?" "Do you think your teachers usually expect too much of you?" and "Are your lowest grades usually your teacher's fault?" For each of the latter two items, a negative answer is considered favorable. It is interesting to note that for the item concerning looking forward to school, the percentage of ninth grade target school favorable response is nearly 20 per cent higher than that for all ninth graders in the city (42.6%). The largest decrease among ninth-grade target pupils in the attitude factor is on the item "Do you

get along better outside of school than in school?" Again, with the negative response considered favorable, this mean decreased 8.5 per cent.

Item percentages for twelfth graders in the one target senior high school are an average of 7.5 per cent higher than the city-wide means for items in the Attitude Toward School factor. Five of the nine items showed target school seniors to have higher percentages. To the item "Do you look forward to coming to school each morning?" target school seniors gave 62.2 per cent favorable response compared to city-wide twelfth grade mean of 31.6 per cent. Only the items "Do you think your teachers usually expect too much of you?" and "Do you read books from the library?" had lower percentages among target school seniors. Again, there is some evidence of a negative trend among secondary level target school pupils on the item concerned with reading. At the ninth grade level, for example, this item has shown a decrease in each of the past two years, falling from 67.7 per cent in 1966 to 55.9 per cent in 1968.

Academic Confidence. On Factor 2, sixth grade target school pupils showed a mean increase of 3.4 per cent favorable response. Six of the seven items included in this factor had higher percentages in 1968. Only the item "Do you think you will graduate from high school?" showed a decline (1.2%). Among control school sixth graders, this same item increased 5.8 per cent. The overall Academic Confidence factor average for the control group, however, decreased from 56.7 per cent to 55.2 per cent, thus falling below the target school mean for 1968.

At the ninth-grade level, the target school mean for Academic Confidence showed a considerable drop, from 54.1 per cent to 50.9 per cent. Meanwhile, the control group remained relatively stable, showing only a .4 per cent decline. Two items, "Do your teachers think you are doing well in your school work?" and "Do your parents think you are doing

well in your school work?", account for most of the decrease among the target group. The percentages of favorable response on these two items went down 8.2 per cent and 6.5 per cent respectively. The 1968 target school ninth grade percentages for these two items fell below those of the control school group and more closely approximate the city-wide ninth-grade response. These decreases suggest that the "generation gap" may be expanding in target schools, at least at the ninth grade level. This hypothesis also receives some support from the higher percentage of negative response to the item "Do you need more help from your teacher?"

Twelfth grade target school pupils, on the other hand, expressed considerably more feeling of help needed than seniors over the city. Only 31.2 per cent of the target school twelfth graders answered this item negatively, compared to 57.8 per cent for all seniors in the system. In this regard, it might be noted that at the sixth grade level, target school pupils have tended to answer this item negatively with increasing frequency over each of the past three years. In spite of this, however, the 1968 percentage for the target school group remains 6.7 per cent below that of all sixth graders. In terms of total academic confidence, twelfth grade target school pupils showed an average that was 7.0 per cent lower than that for all seniors in the city. Only two of the items had higher percentages among the target school group.

Other Items. Nine items on the survey are not in either of the two factors. Of these, all but the last item, "Do you think you could do well in any kind of job you choose?", are somewhat associated with attitude toward school according to the pattern of intercorrelations. Among sixth grade target school pupils, these nine items show an average decrease of .9 per cent. Five of the items declined in favorable response from 1967 to 1968, three went up, and one stayed the same. The greatest

decline (3.2%) was for the item "Do you enjoy field trips?" Both this item and the one that follows, "Do field trips help you in school work?", show a continuous decline in favorable percentage from 1966 forward among sixth grade target school pupils. By contrast, every one of the nine items showed an increase among sixth grade control pupils. The overall control average for these items increased from 78.7 per cent in 1967 to 82.7 per cent in 1968.

At the ninth-grade level, on the other hand, target and control groups had almost identical averages in 1967: 73.3 per cent for target, 73.4 per cent for control. In 1968 the target mean dropped to 72.1 per cent, while that for control schools went down to 70.1 per cent. The 1.2 per cent decrease among ninth grade target school pupils resulted from decreasing percentages on five items, while three items increased and one remained the same. The item "Do you read more than is required by your school work?" dropped 7.5 per cent, resulting in a total decrease of 11.4 per cent over a two-year period. The target school percentage has thus fallen considerably below that for all ninth graders in the city (40.9%).

Comparison of twelfth grade target percentages on these nine items to those of all seniors in the city shows that target school seniors averaged 2.6 per cent more favorable response, having higher percentages on seven of the items. A difference of 10 per cent or more exists for two items. "Do you enjoy field trips?" was answered affirmatively by 93.0 per cent of target school seniors and only 82.7 per cent of all seniors in the city. On the other hand, "Do you hope to go to college?" showed 58.9 per cent affirmative response among target school seniors compared to 68.9 per cent city-wide.

Conclusions

From the survey results the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. Overall, the Student Survey offers no evidence of positive impact of Title I services in target schools during the 1967-68 school year. At the sixth grade level, in fact, there was a significant decline in favorable response compared to control school results. The absence of a significant difference at the ninth grade level indicates that whatever impact the program might have had was not great enough to appear in this gross measurement.
2. Target school pupils' attitude toward school was less favorable in 1968 than in the preceding year at both grade 6 and grade 9. The decline among ninth grade pupils, however, was less than that for control schools, and both grade nine and twelve in target schools showed a more favorable attitude than that of secondary pupils throughout the city.
3. Academic confidence increased among target school sixth graders; the ninth grade measure on this factor indicated a decline. At grades six, nine, and twelve the target school mean for academic confidence was lower than the city-wide mean.
4. On the basis of item differences of 5.0 per cent or more from 1967 to 1968, a number of generalizations may be made about changes in target pupil response.
 - a. Sixth grade target pupils like school less, have less positive feelings about their own schools, and are less inclined to spend more time in school.
 - b. Target school sixth graders are more satisfied with the grades on their report cards and feel more strongly that their teachers believe they are doing well in their school work. Ninth graders, on the other hand, are less positive about both teachers' and parents' appraisal of their school work.
 - c. An increasing number of ninth graders believe they are able to get along better outside of school than in school.
 - d. Reading habits reported by ninth graders in target schools show a disturbing decline. These pupils report less frequent reading of books from the library and less reading beyond the requirements of their school work.
5. Target school sixth graders' decreasing valence toward school and ninth graders' declining reading habits are substantiated by study of survey results over a three-year period. A trend is also suggested toward a less favorable attitude of sixth graders toward field trips and a lessening feeling of need for additional help from teachers.

Summary

Continuing the attempt of the past two years to assess the effect of the Title I program on pupil attitudes, the Student Survey was again administered in May, 1968. The survey form was kept intact from the previous year, but the plan for administration was modified to include all pupils in the system in grades 6, 9, and 12. Because Title I services were now being phased out of secondary target schools, a group of eight elementary level and three secondary level schools from the secondary target classification were selected for control or comparison purposes. Thus, in analyzing the results of the survey, the basic comparison was of changes from 1967 to 1968 in the responses of sixth and ninth grade target and control pupils. City-wide results were also compared, particularly at the twelfth grade level since twelfth graders had not completed the survey in 1967.

Sixth grade target school pupils responded significantly less favorably to the 1968 survey. Although no significant difference was found in comparing target and control changes at the ninth grade level, this group of target school pupils also responded less favorably than in 1967. This was particularly true concerning items in the Attitude Toward School factor. In spite of this, however, target pupils in grades 9 and 12 continued to show a more favorable attitude than that of their counterparts throughout the city. Meanwhile, the Academic Confidence factor increased among sixth grade target school pupils. Ninth graders, on the other hand, showed a decline in this area. At all three grade levels, the target school mean on this factor was lower than that of the city. An examination of survey results over a three-year period suggests a trend in the declining attractiveness of school for target sixth graders and less desirable reading habits among target school ninth graders.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS OF PARENT SURVEY, 1968

Background

Involvement of parents is an essential ingredient in any attempt to effect real improvement in the education of the disadvantaged. Of prime importance are parental attitudes toward, and relationships with their children. Almost as significant is the way the parents feel about education and the people and activities related to this process.

Measurement of parental attitude, therefore, has been considered necessary in evaluating the impact of the Title I program for disadvantaged youth. The technique established for this measurement was completed in a door-to-door interview by parent aides assigned to target schools. Analysis of results from previous years of administrations of this survey have suggested that it is probably the least valid and reliable of the locally developed Title I surveys. Nevertheless, the importance of parent attitudes dictate continued use of the Parent Survey despite the expense and technical limitations of the instrument.

Description of Survey

The year 1968 marked the third year of the Parent Survey's use. Previous interviews had been conducted among a random sample of 20 to 30 parents from each of the schools in the primary target, secondary target, and control groups. On one occasion a suburban school sample also had been included for comparative purposes. In 1968, the survey was limited to the primary target schools and the secondary target schools ranking highest in economic deprivation. The same group of eight elementary and three secondary level, secondary target schools was used as a control or comparison group as in the other surveys.

It is important to note that target parents completing the survey were not necessarily those of pupils receiving service in the Title I program. The universe of parents sampled was all those having children in attendance at the target schools. The survey items do not connect the interview with the Title I program in any identifiable way. Parents react to general questions about their child's education and not to the worthwhileness of the Title I endeavor. It was believed that an undesirable Hawthorne effect might be created if parents were asked to react directly to the effects of Title I.

Each of the 18 items on the Parent Survey is in the form of a question to which the parent responds. In the 1966 survey three response choices were given: much, some and not at all. Much and some were considered affirmative responses. For 1967 and 1968 the alternatives were simplified to yes and no.

Another change in the survey after the first year was the substitution of seven items for others that no longer seemed appropriate. Since the instrument was identical in 1967 and 1968, there are eleven items common to all three years.

Method of Analysis

The survey forms were processed by Digitek and item data assembled for the target and control groups of schools. Mean percentages of affirmative responses to each item were compared for the two groups with similar data from 1966 and 1967. Replies of parents of elementary and secondary level children were treated separately. The 1966 results of the survey had been factor analyzed. This analysis yielded seven clusters of items, a constellation that has been retained in the presentation of results in this report. Items new to the survey in 1967 were added rationally to the factor structure, thereby also forming one additional factor.

Analysis of covariance was used to test the significance of difference between 1968 responses of target and control parents. Percentage of affirmative response in 1967 was used as a covariable. In effect, then, the analysis tested the significance of difference in the changes in responses of the two groups from one year to the next.

Results

Table 9 compares the percentages of affirmative responses made by parents of elementary target and control school pupils over a three-year period. Because of survey changes following the 1966 administration, percentage differences are reported from 1967 to 1968.

It is immediately obvious that both target and control parents were considerably less affirmative in 1968 than they had been in 1966 in their responses to the 11 common items. With one exception among target parents and two among control parents, all items show a net decline over the two years. On the average, the difference is -4.8 per cent for target parents and -2.9 per cent for the control group. It is likely, however, that the two affirmative alternatives in 1966 (much and some) increased the frequency of affirmative response, thereby distorting the comparison with succeeding years.

For 1967 and 1968, on the other hand, the survey was identical, so that meaningful comparisons are possible among all items and all eight factors. On the average, parents of elementary target school pupils gave 2.4 per cent more affirmative response in 1968 than in 1967. This mean percentage increased from 75.1 per cent to 77.5 per cent, with 14 of the 18 items showing higher percentages in 1968. The mean for control parents also increased, but to a lesser degree (1.1%). Parents of elementary control school pupils averaged 78.2 per cent affirmative response in 1967

Table 9. Percentages of Affirmative Response to Parent Survey, ELEMENTARY, by School Group, Year, Factor, and Item.

FACTOR Item	(N)	TARGET SCHOOLS				CONTROL SCHOOLS			
		1966 (195)	1967 (228)	1968 (304)	1968- 1967	1966 (127)	1967 (160)	1968 (209)	1968- 1967
FACTOR 1: ACADEMIC MOTIVATION									
- Does _____ study at home?		90.7%	79.9%	84.5%	+4.6%	89.0%	81.9%	86.5%	+4.6%
- Does _____ read at home?		92.3	86.8	87.5	+ .7	94.5	86.8	87.8	+1.0
- Has _____ studied harder this year than last year?		--	71.5	73.8	+2.3	--	76.8	79.8	+3.0
FACTOR AVERAGE		--	79.4	81.9	+2.5	--	81.8	84.7	+2.9
FACTOR 2: ACADEMIC SUCCESS									
- Is _____ improving in (his or her) school work?		92.7	84.2	89.8	+5.6	96.0	85.6	85.4	- .2
- Do you think _____ will finish high school?		--	95.9	94.6	-1.3	--	96.9	90.2	-6.7
- Do you think _____ will go to college?		--	51.6	55.8	+4.2	--	58.5	59.3	+ .8
FACTOR AVERAGE		--	77.2	80.1	+2.9	--	80.3	78.3	-2.0
FACTOR 3: VALENCE TOWARD SCHOOL									
- Does _____ like school?		96.4	93.0	95.7	+2.7	100.0	97.5	97.6	+ .1
- Do you like _____'s school?		99.0	96.9	97.3	+ .4	96.9	96.9	96.2	- .7
- Would you like to know more about _____'s school?		87.1	83.7	89.9	+6.2	96.9	80.5	82.9	+2.4
FACTOR AVERAGE		94.2	91.2	94.3	+3.1	97.9	91.6	92.2	+ .6
FACTOR 4: PROFESSIONAL STAFF INTEREST									
- Do you think the teacher and principal are interested in _____?		97.9	94.2	94.3	+ .1	95.9	96.9	97.1	+ .2
FACTOR 5: USE OF LEISURE									
- Has the school helped you to do more things with _____?		89.1	73.5	79.7	+6.2	82.7	79.4	80.0	+ .6
- Has the school helped _____ in the use of (his or her) out-of-school time?		81.0	62.9	73.8	+10.9	75.6	71.2	80.5	+9.3
FACTOR AVERAGE		85.0	68.2	76.8	+8.6	79.2	75.3	80.3	+5.0
FACTOR 6: PARENT INVOLVEMENT									
- Have you been encouraged to participate in school activities?		82.6	76.5	77.6	+1.1	85.0	86.3	91.8	+5.5
- Are you in any way active in the school?		40.5	28.3	26.2	-2.1	30.7	25.8	25.5	- .3
FACTOR AVERAGE		61.6	52.4	51.9	- .5	57.9	56.1	58.7	+2.6
FACTOR 7: SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS									
- Does _____ get along well with other students in school?		--	95.4	94.6	- .8	--	96.3	96.6	+ .3
- Do you approve of _____'s friends?		--	91.1	86.9	-4.2	--	94.3	93.8	- .5
FACTOR AVERAGE		--	93.3	90.8	-2.5	--	95.3	95.2	- .1
FACTOR 8: PUPIL HEALTH									
- Has _____'s health been better this year than last year?		--	74.3	76.6	+2.3	--	80.2	84.0	+3.8
- Have you talked to the school nurse about _____?		--	12.6	15.7	+3.1	--	15.0	12.0	-3.0
FACTOR AVERAGE		--	43.5	46.2	+2.7	--	47.6	48.0	+ .4
TOTAL SURVEY AVERAGE									
		--	75.1	77.5	+2.4	--	78.2	79.3	+1.1

and 79.3 per cent in 1968. Adjusted for differences in the 1967 responses, the 1968 means for target and control groups are not significantly different.

Table 10 presents the results of the survey of parents of children in target and control secondary level schools. The decrease from 1966 to 1968 is considerably larger for both groups than at the elementary level. Target school responses show a mean decline of 13.1 per cent and control responses of 9.0 per cent. From 1967 to 1968, parents of target pupils at the secondary level showed little difference in response, averaging 73.7 per cent affirmative reply in 1967 and 73.9 per cent in 1968. Among control parents, on the other hand, the affirmative responses for 1967 averaged 78.8 per cent, and for 1968, 76.9 per cent, a 1.9 per cent decline. This target-control difference was also tested and found nonsignificant by analysis of covariance.

Examining the response percentages by factor and item will provide additional insight into parental attitudes. Each of the eight factors will be discussed in terms of both elementary and secondary levels.

Academic Motivation. Target school parents reported that their children were engaged in school activities at home to a greater extent than in 1967. The average percentage of affirmative response to this factor increased 2.5 per cent among elementary target schools and .4 per cent at the secondary level. The largest increase, however, was among elementary control schools (2.9%). Secondary control schools, on the other hand, declined 10.0 per cent.

At the elementary level, both target and control parents answered all three items in the factor more affirmatively in 1968. The item "Does _____ study at home" showed the greatest gain: 4.6 per cent for both school groups. This same item gained 5.5 per cent among secondary

Table 10. Percentages of Affirmative Response to Parent Survey, SECONDARY, by School Group, Year, Factor and Item.

FACTOR Item	(N)	TARGET SCHOOLS				CONTROL SCHOOLS			
		1966 (71)	1967 (65)	1968 (89)	1968- 1967	1966 (40)	1967 (57)	1968 (71)	1968 1967
FACTOR 1: ACADEMIC MOTIVATION									
- Does _____ study at home?		87.3%	75.4%	80.9%	+5.5%	92.5%	86.0%	77.5%	-8.5%
- Does _____ read at home?		97.8	86.2	82.0	-4.2	97.5	89.5	78.3	-11.2
- Has _____ studied harder this year than last year?		--	75.4	75.3	- .1	--	82.1	71.8	-10.3
FACTOR AVERAGE		--	79.0	79.4	+ .4	--	85.9	75.9	-10.0
FACTOR 2: ACADEMIC SUCCESS									
- Is _____ improving in (his or her) school work?		98.6	84.6	87.6	+3.0	97.5	98.2	84.3	-13.9
- Do you think _____ will finish high school?		--	88.9	96.6	+5.7	--	94.7	92.9	-1.8
- Do you think _____ will go to college?		--	43.1	40.9	-2.2	--	75.0	57.7	-17.3
FACTOR AVERAGE		--	72.2	75.0	+2.8	--	89.3	78.3	-11.0
FACTOR 3: VALENCE TOWARD SCHOOL									
- Does _____ like school?		97.2	86.2	93.3	+7.1	97.5	93.0	81.4	-11.6
- Do you like _____'s school?		97.8	98.5	95.5	-3.0	94.9	84.2	95.5	+11.3
- Would you like to know more about _____'s school?		98.6	93.8	92.0	-1.8	97.5	87.7	91.4	+3.7
FACTOR AVERAGE		97.9	92.8	93.6	+ .8	96.6	88.3	89.4	+1.1
FACTOR 4: PROFESSIONAL STAFF INTEREST									
- Do you think the teacher and principal are interested in _____?		98.6	93.5	95.5	+2.0	97.4	96.4	97.2	+ .8
FACTOR 5: USE OF LEISURE									
- Has the school helped you to do more things with _____?		92.9	60.0	71.6	+11.6	89.7	76.8	88.2	+11.4
- Has the school helped _____ in the use of (his or her) out-of-school time?		92.9	64.1	64.8	+ .7	87.5	76.8	77.9	+1.1
FACTOR AVERAGE		92.9	62.1	68.2	+6.1	88.6	76.8	83.1	+6.3
FACTOR 6: PARENT INVOLVEMENT									
- Have you been encouraged to participate in school activities?		80.3	63.1	44.9	-18.2	77.5	64.3	70.0	+5.7
- Are you in any way active in the school?		46.5	18.8	37.1	+18.3	47.5	26.4	36.6	+10.2
FACTOR AVERAGE		63.4	41.0	41.0	0	62.5	45.4	53.3	+7.9
FACTOR 7: SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS									
- Does _____ get along well with other students in school?		--	96.9	95.5	-1.4	--	94.6	100.0	+5.4
- Do you approve of _____'s friends?		--	90.5	95.5	+5.0	--	92.7	85.1	-7.6
FACTOR AVERAGE		--	93.7	95.5	+1.8	--	93.7	92.6	-1.1
FACTOR 8: PUPIL HEALTH									
- Has _____'s health been better this year than last year?		--	91.7	74.2	-17.5	--	80.7	71.8	-8.9
- Have you talked to the school nurse about _____?		--	15.6	6.7	-8.9	--	19.3	25.7	+6.4
FACTOR AVERAGE		--	53.7	40.5	-13.2	--	50.0	48.8	-1.2
TOTAL SURVEY AVERAGE									
		--	73.7	73.9	+ .2	--	78.8	76.9	-1.9

level target schools, but "Does _____ read at home" declined 4.2 per cent. This decrease is small, though, compared to that for every item in Factor 1 among secondary control schools. The larger percentage differences at the secondary level must be interpreted in the light of the smaller numbers of respondents.

Academic Success. Response changes for the factor related to success in school definitely favor the target group. At both the elementary and the secondary level, average percentage of affirmative response is up about 3.0 per cent for the target schools. On the other hand, this same average declined among control schools, especially at the secondary level.

More target than control parents reported improvement of their children's school work, and more believed their children will finish high school. Affirmative response to this latter item, however, decreased a little among elementary target parents. Control parents, meanwhile, predicted college for their children with greater frequency than target parents. Interestingly, there is a difference of 14.9 per cent between elementary and secondary level responses to this item among target parents, while the control difference is only 1.6 per cent.

Valence Toward School. Factor 3 shows an increase in affirmative response across all groups. Elementary target parents show both the greatest gain (3.1%) and the highest 1968 percentage (94.3%). Each of the other school groups gained about 1.0 per cent.

Among target parents, there was an increase in the percentage of affirmative response to "Does _____ like school?": 2.7 per cent at the elementary level and 7.1 per cent at the secondary. The other two items in the factor, concerned with parent, rather than student attitude, declined among secondary level target schools. Elementary target parents,

by contrast, answered "Would you like to know more about _____'s school?" 6.2 per cent more affirmatively in 1968.

Professional Staff Interest. As with Valence Toward School, the one item factor concerned with staff interest shows gains across all groups. None of these differences, however, is large enough to be meaningful. At both levels, control parents answered this item more affirmatively than target parents.

Use of Leisure. The factor relating to use of out-of-school time also shows increased affirmative response among all groups. The largest increase (8.6%) is for the elementary target school group, where the percentage went from 68.2 per cent in 1967 to 76.8 per cent in 1968. Still, this percentage remained lower than that for elementary control parents (80.3%). Increases at the secondary level were about 6.0 per cent for each group. Again, however, the target percentage was lower: 68.2 per cent, compared to 83.1 per cent for control.

All school groups answered "Has the school helped you to do more things with _____?" more affirmatively than "Has the school helped _____ in the use of (his or her) out-of-school time?" Nevertheless, the latter item shows a greater percentage of increase than the former at the elementary level. The only noteworthy target vs. control difference is in the elementary response to the parent-child activity item, where the target percentage increased 6.2 per cent to approximate that of the control group.

Parent Involvement. According to survey responses, parent involvement in school remained about the same in target schools while showing an increase for the control group. At both levels, 1968 control group responses were more affirmative than target responses. Secondary control schools show an increase of 7.9 per cent.

Most of the gain in secondary control response was traceable to more affirmative answers to "Are you in any way active in the school?" Secondary level target school parents also professed to be much more active in school, although they said they had been encouraged considerably less to participate in school activities. Among this group, 18.2 per cent fewer parents indicated in 1968 that they had been encouraged to participate in such activity. On the other hand, affirmative response to the question whether they were active increased 18.3 per cent. The 44.9 per cent affirmative response to "Have you been encouraged to participate in school activities?" among the target school parents is 25.1 per cent lower than the percentage of affirmative response for the control group. Although the differences among these percentages are inflated by the small number of parents interviewed, these results are somewhat startling. They seem to contain a foreboding of the dissatisfaction among target school secondary level parents with the extent of their involvement in school policy formation.

Social Relationships. Parent reactions to the social relationships of their children show a decline for every school group except the target schools at the secondary level. Here, the percentage of affirmative response for this factor is 1.8 per cent higher in 1968. The elementary target percentage decreased most, 2.5 per cent.

Parents of elementary target school pupils indicated less approval of their children's friends than in 1967. Among secondary level target parents, on the other hand, this same item shows an increase, with 95.5 per cent answering affirmatively.

Pupil Health. Parent responses suggest that the health level of elementary school target youngsters improved slightly in 1968. At the secondary level, on the other hand, there is a marked decline for this factor. Control school responses remained fairly stable, showing a

percentage gain of .4 at the elementary and a 1.2 per cent decrease at the secondary level.

A large decrease occurred at the secondary level in the target school response to "Has _____'s health been better this year than last year?" The percentage of affirmative response for this item fell from 91.7 per cent in 1967 to 74.2 per cent in 1968. Although the percentage for the control group also decreased, the difference is much smaller.

Conclusions

Several conclusions may be drawn from the comparison of responses to the Parent Survey over a three-year period:

1. Target school parents, especially at the elementary level, had somewhat more favorable opinions in 1968 than in 1967 on school-related matters in the survey. The small gain at the secondary level is made to seem more encouraging by a decline in affirmative response among the control group.
2. Nevertheless, the lack of significance of difference between target and control 1968 results, adjusted for 1967 differences, leads to the generalization that no gain associated with the Title I program was revealed by the Parent Survey. From 1966 to 1968, on the other hand, the decline in affirmative response is greater among target parents, suggesting that the initially strong positive reaction to the Title I program has been somewhat neutralized by time.
3. In terms of change from 1967, responses in 1968 favored the target groups at both levels on one factor, Academic Success. Similarly, only one factor, Parent Involvement, favored both levels of controls. Of the six factors showing mixed patterns, three favored the elementary target group, and the other three, the secondary level target group.
4. Several individual items suggest interesting generalizations:
 - a. Parents of secondary pupils reported that their children were reading less at home.
 - b. Secondary level target parents were less optimistic about a college education for their children than control counterparts.
 - c. Target parents at both levels said their children liked school with greater frequency than in 1967.

- d. Secondary level target parents reported more participation in school in 1968 than previously, but they indicated that they had received less encouragement in this regard.
- e. In both target and control groups, secondary parents reported less improvement of pupil health than in 1967.

Summary

The Parent Survey, as administered in May, 1966, the first year of Title I services and modified in 1967, was administered again in May, 1968 to parents of samples of children in target and control schools. Parent aides assigned to the schools asked each parent to respond yes or no to a group of 18 items. This report compares percentages of affirmative response in each of the three years, by parents of pupils in target and control schools, at the elementary and secondary levels.

Responses in 1968 among target parents, although considerably less affirmative than in the first year of the survey, were more strongly positive than in 1967. This was particularly true at the elementary level. Comparison of changes from 1967 to 1968 in target and control school groups showed no significant difference. Inspection of items within the factor groupings indicated that target school parents believed that pupils were showing more promise of success in academic activities. At the secondary level, target school parents professed to be more actively involved in school activities even though they reported receiving less encouragement to do so.

CHAPTER 6

PUPIL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, 1968

Background

Over the past several decades the role of the school, as dictated by public expectation, has broadened appreciably. Added to the responsibility for intellectual development and imparting of knowledge, many other tasks have been assigned by implication as the community looks to the school as a potent agent in preparing youth for adult life. That "educating the whole man" has been relegated to the realm of cliches definitely does not mean that society expects anything less than this of its schools.

On the other hand, there does seem to be, in more recent years, a decrease in emphasis on social development and other goals that are peripheral to the traditional focus of education. Perhaps because more people have accepted the fact that schools are not omnipotent, but more likely because of the increasing demands of our technological age, focus seems to be returning to the school's responsibility for providing pupils with the basic academic tools considered necessary for functioning in our society.

Under Title I of the Education Act, primary concern in evaluating the efficacy of educational improvements has been with the effect on pupil academic achievement. Certainly part of the reason for this emphasis is that measurement in this area is recognized as considerably more advanced than that in the affective realm. It is possible to put much more faith in the results of standardized achievement tests than in those of attitude scales or personality tests. In addition to this limitation, however, there does appear to be a philosophical base for emphasizing achievement as an educational goal and considering other objectives such as improved attendance or better attitudes as secondary or supportive.

Based on this rationale, Title I evaluation in Cincinnati, over each of the past three years, has given considerable attention to measuring academic achievement. In the 1965-66 school year, a special spring testing program was introduced for Title I purposes. The Stanford Achievement Tests were selected for this program on the basis of their apparent content validity. Testing was conducted in primary target, secondary target and control schools among those grades that were not covered in the regular city-wide testing program.

The primary intent in this first year of testing was to establish baseline data for future comparison. In general, the results confirmed the expectancy that primary target schools would score lowest of the three groups in academic achievement. Also confirmed was the notion of the cumulative deficit which takes place in the academic life of disadvantaged children. As target school pupils progress through the grades, the deviation of their scores from national achievement norms increases. The average annual growth of the target school pupil in months of academic achievement was found to be about 6.5 months.

These initial findings were confirmed in the second year of testing, 1966-67. In general, the results of this second year followed very closely those of the preceding baseline year. This finding was not surprising because it had been recognized at the outset that changes in measures of pupil achievement, particularly when viewed in terms of the entire school population, can be brought about only very slowly. The 1966-67 evaluation, however, added a comparative study of achievement of pupils receiving the highest degree of Title I services and that of other pupils not served under Title I. Although it was obvious that a selection bias is inevitable in any project designed to serve the most seriously disadvantaged, the absence of significant difference in this latter study was a serious disappointment.

The same basic testing program conducted in the previous two years was retained in the 1967-68 school year. Increasing objections were received from members of the professional staff that the Stanford Battery was too demanding, that many project pupils were unable to read the items on the test, etc. It was felt, nevertheless, that an additional year of measurement with comparable instruments should be conducted before a serious attempt was initiated to select more suitable tests. Thus, in May, 1968, the Stanford batteries were administered to pupils in grades 2, 3, 4, 7, and 9 of target schools. For grades 5 and 6 test results for March and January, respectively, were available from the city-wide testing program. The test battery and form given at each grade level are shown below.

GRADE	MONTH	BATTERY	FORM
2	May, 1968	Primary I	W
3	May, 1968	Primary II	X
4	May, 1968	Intermediate I	X
5	March, 1968	Intermediate II	X
6	January, 1968	Intermediate II	X
7	May, 1968	Advanced	W
8	May, 1968	Advanced	W

Method of Analysis

Distributions of grade scores for each grade and subtest were made for target and control schools. The control group was composed of the same eight elementary and three junior high schools (from the secondary target classification) as used throughout this study. Quartile points in these distributions were compared without statistical tests of significance. The large number of scores in each distribution suggests very small standard error statistics. Thus, except for one-month differences, which could be largely a function of rounding the grade equivalents, any disparity in the distributions probably warrants attention.

In addition to quartile comparisons of target and control school 1968 results, longitudinal comparisons were made of target school quartiles over the last three years. For grades 2, 3, and 9, these comparisons were somewhat incomplete because of changes in test administration patterns.

One final approach was used in analyzing achievement data. As part of a large-scale effort to increase the store of data available for evaluation, school unit information on over 100 variables was collected and factor analyzed. Subsequent development of this data bank will be reported in detail in the 1968-69 program evaluation report. In its initial application to Title I evaluation, this collection of data was used to compare actual target and control median sixth-grade achievement on the Paragraph Meaning and Arithmetic Computation subtests with median achievement as predicted from socio-economic characteristics, I.Q., and previous achievement. Since the data bank was started with information for 1965-66, 1966-67, and 1967-68, it was possible, after determining correlations among variables and analyzing regression over the first two years, to apply these regression equations to the prediction of 1967-68 achievement. Mean differences between actual and predicted achievement were then compared for target and control schools.

Results

Table 11 provides a cross-sectional comparison of grade equivalent results of standardized tests. The three quartiles for target and control school groups are reported by grade level and subtest. Grades 2, 3, 4, 7, and 9 were tested specially for Title I purposes at the conclusion of the academic year. The results for grades 5 and 6, on the other hand, come from tests administered as a part of the regular city-wide testing program in March and January, respectively. All grades took one of the Stanford batteries with subtests selected, in some cases, on the basis of appropriateness or time allotment.

Table 11. Summary of Standardized Achievement Test Grade Equivalents, by School Group, Grade, and Subtest.

Grade Level (Grade Norm) Date of Testing Battery Used Subtest	PRIMARY TARGET			CONTROL		
	Mdn.			Mdn.		
	Q ₁	Q ₂	Q ₃	Q ₁	Q ₂	Q ₃
Grade 2 (Norm: 2.9)	N=1264			N= 698		
May, 1968						
Stanford Primary I, Form W						
Word Reading	1.7	1.9	2.5	1.7	1.9	2.4
Paragraph Meaning	1.7	1.9	2.5	1.6	1.9	2.5
Vocabulary	1.5	1.9	2.4	1.5	1.9	2.5
Spelling	1.8	2.2	2.8	1.8	2.3	2.8
Arithmetic	1.7	2.1	2.4	1.7	2.1	2.4
Grade 3 (Norm: 3.9)	N=1149			N= 661		
May, 1968						
Stanford Primary II, Form X						
Word Meaning	2.1	2.7	3.1	2.1	2.7	3.3
Paragraph Meaning	2.1	2.6	3.1	2.3	2.7	3.1
Spelling	2.2	2.9	3.6	2.3	3.0	3.8
Language	2.2	2.5	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.9
Arithmetic Computation	2.5	2.8	3.6	2.6	3.0	3.7
Arithmetic Concepts	2.2	2.6	3.2	2.3	2.6	3.2
Grade 4 (Norm: 4.9)	N=1110			N= 716		
May, 1968						
Stanford Intermediate I, Form X						
Word Meaning	3.0	3.3	3.9	2.9	3.3	3.9
Paragraph Meaning	2.6	3.1	3.9	2.7	3.1	3.8
Language	2.4	2.7	3.4	2.4	2.7	3.3
Arithmetic Computation	3.1	3.7	4.3	3.1	3.7	4.3
Arithmetic Concepts	2.7	3.3	4.1	2.7	3.3	4.3
Grade 5 (Norm: 5.7)	N=1015			N= 733		
March, 1968						
Stanford Intermediate II, Form X						
Word Meaning	3.5	3.9	4.6	3.5	4.1	4.9
Paragraph Meaning	3.2	3.9	4.6	3.2	3.9	4.7
Arithmetic Computation	3.6	4.4	5.0	3.6	4.4	5.0
Arithmetic Concepts	3.6	4.3	4.9	4.0	4.3	5.2
Arithmetic Applications	3.6	4.0	4.6	3.6	4.2	4.9
Grade 6 (Norm: 6.5)	N=1003			N= 629		
January, 1968						
Stanford Intermediate II, Form X						
Word Meaning	3.9	4.4	5.2	3.8	4.4	5.4
Paragraph Meaning	3.8	4.4	5.2	3.8	4.4	5.4
Spelling	4.0	5.0	6.2	4.3	5.1	6.3
Language	3.2	3.8	4.7	3.3	4.0	5.1
Arithmetic Computation	4.1	4.8	5.4	4.4	5.0	5.8
Arithmetic Concepts	4.1	4.6	5.4	4.3	4.9	5.9
Arithmetic Applications	3.8	4.4	5.1	3.9	4.6	5.6
Grade 7 (Norm: 7.9)	N= 918			N= 969		
May, 1968						
Stanford Advanced, Form W						
Paragraph Meaning	4.6	5.3	6.2	4.4	5.2	6.2
Language	4.1	4.9	6.2	4.2	5.0	6.3
Arithmetic Computation	4.5	5.4	6.2	4.5	5.4	6.0
Arithmetic Concepts	5.4	6.0	6.6	5.1	6.0	6.6
Grade 9 (Norm: 9.9)	N= 598			N= 776		
May, 1968						
Stanford Advanced, Form W						
Paragraph Meaning	5.2	6.3	7.6	5.3	6.4	7.8
Language	4.8	5.9	7.1	5.1	6.2	7.5
Arithmetic Computation	5.4	6.3	7.8	5.1	6.0	7.2
Arithmetic Concepts	6.0	6.9	8.0	6.0	6.9	8.0

An examination of the data in Table 11 indicates that there is relatively little difference between target and control schools in the pattern of quartiles. What difference there is generally favors the control group. A few of the control quartiles run several months higher than their target school counterparts, and the number of subtests in which the control distribution is higher for control schools exceeds that for which target schools have a higher distribution.

At grade 2, the Paragraph Meaning subtest shows a one-month difference favoring the primary target group at Q_1 , and a similar one-month difference in Word Reading at Q_3 . The median for Spelling and Q_3 for Vocabulary, on the other hand, favor the control school group.

Grade 3 shows eleven subtest differences in quartiles. Without exception, these favor control schools. None of the differences, however, is greater than two months. The Spelling and Arithmetic Computation subtests show the greatest differences between types of schools in the overall distribution.

At grade 4 there is one subtest (Word Meaning) on which Q_1 for target schools is higher than for controls. Similarly, at Q_3 Paragraph Meaning favors target schools by one month. On the other hand, Q_1 on Paragraph Meaning is one month higher among control schools, as is Q_3 for Language.

At grade 5 the seven quartile points at which a difference is found between target and control schools all favor the control school group. The Arithmetic Concepts subtest shows a four-month difference at the first quartile and three months at Q_3 . All other subtest differences occur at the second and third quartile points.

Sixth grade shows greatest disparity between target and control results. Eighteen of the 21 quartile points are different, with 17 of

these differences favoring control schools. The exception is a one-month target school advantage at Q_1 on the Word Meaning subtest. Five-month differences are found at Q_3 on Arithmetic Concepts and Arithmetic Application.

Of seven differences at the seventh grade, four favor target schools. Only the Language subtest shows higher quartiles for the control group, one month at each quartile point. Target schools, on the other hand, are three months higher at Q_1 in Arithmetic Concepts, two months higher at Q_1 in Paragraph Meaning and Q_3 in Arithmetic Computation, and one month higher at the Paragraph Meaning Median.

In grade 9 the advantage is again with control schools. For Arithmetic Computation, target school quartiles are appreciably higher. The other six differences, ranging from one to four months, all favor the control group.

In all, 48 of 61 quartile difference favor the control schools. In the elementary grades, only six differences in 45 favor target schools--all are one-month differences, clearly attributable to chance. Grades 7 and 9 offer a more encouraging picture, with seven of 16 differences favoring target schools.

Of the differences that favor target schools, six are at Q_1 , two at Q_2 , and five at Q_3 . Those favoring control schools are divided 14, 14, and 20, respectively. It is reasonable to anticipate that the first real signs of Title I impact would be visible at the Q_1 level since the program offers services to the most seriously disadvantaged. The data reported in Table 11 do not reflect such impact.

Comparison of another dimension is presented in Table 12. Here, target school subtest quartiles are reported by grade for each of the past three years insofar as comparable instruments were used. All results reported are from Stanford achievement batteries; the test levels are the

Table 12. Grade Equivalent Quartiles of (Primary) Target Schools, by Year, Grade, and Subtest

Grade Level Subtest	Q ₁			Q ₂			Q ₃		
	1966	1967	1968	1966	1967	1968	1966	1967	1968
Grade 2 (Norm)				--	(2.9)	(2.9)			
Word Reading	--	1.7	1.7	--	1.9	1.9	--	2.6	2.5
Paragraph Meaning	--	1.7	1.7	--	2.0	1.9	--	2.5	2.5
Vocabulary	--	1.5	1.5	--	1.9	1.9	--	2.4	2.4
Spelling	--	1.8	1.8	--	2.3	2.2	--	2.8	2.8
Arithmetic	--	1.7	1.7	--	2.0	2.1	--	2.4	2.4
Grade 3 (Norm)				(3.9)	--	(3.9)			
Word Meaning	2.1	--	2.1	2.7	--	2.7	3.1	--	3.1
Paragraph Meaning	2.0	--	2.1	2.6	--	2.6	3.1	--	3.1
Spelling	--	--	2.2	--	--	2.9	--	--	3.6
Language	--	--	2.2	--	--	2.5	--	--	2.8
Arithmetic Computation	2.6	--	2.5	3.0	--	2.8	3.6	--	3.6
Arithmetic Concepts	2.2	--	2.2	2.6	--	2.6	3.2	--	3.2
Grade 4 (Norm)				(4.9)	(4.9)	(4.9)			
Word Meaning	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.9	3.9	3.9
Paragraph Meaning	2.6	2.6	2.6	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.8	3.8	3.9
Language	2.6	2.6	2.4	3.0	3.0	2.7	3.6	3.5	3.4
Arithmetic Computation	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.3	4.3	4.3
Arithmetic Concepts	2.6	2.7	2.7	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.2	4.3	4.1
Grade 5 (Norm)				(5.9)	--	(5.7)			
Word Meaning	3.2	--	3.5	3.9	--	3.9	4.7	--	4.6
Paragraph Meaning	3.1	--	3.2	3.9	--	3.9	4.7	--	4.6
Arithmetic Computation	3.7	--	3.6	4.5	--	4.4	5.2	--	5.0
Arithmetic Concepts	3.7	--	3.6	4.4	--	4.3	5.1	--	4.9
Arithmetic Applications	3.6	--	3.6	4.1	--	4.0	4.8	--	4.6
Grade 6 (Norm)				(6.6)	(6.5)	(6.5)			
Word Meaning	3.8	3.8	3.9	4.6	4.4	4.4	5.7	5.4	5.2
Paragraph Meaning	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.6	4.4	4.4	5.6	5.3	5.2
Spelling	4.2	4.1	4.0	5.1	4.8	5.0	6.3	5.9	6.2
Language	3.3	3.2	3.2	4.1	3.8	3.8	5.2	4.9	4.7
Arithmetic Computation	4.3	4.1	4.1	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.8	5.6	5.4
Arithmetic Concepts	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.7	4.6	4.6	5.5	5.5	5.4
Arithmetic Applications	3.9	3.8	3.8	4.5	4.2	4.4	5.5	5.1	5.1
Grade 7 (Norm)				(7.9)	(7.9)	(7.9)			
Paragraph Meaning	4.3	4.2	4.6	5.2	5.0	5.3	6.1	6.0	6.2
Language	4.0	3.5	4.1	4.8	4.7	4.9	5.8	5.8	6.2
Arithmetic Computation	4.5	4.6	4.5	5.4	5.4	5.4	6.2	6.1	6.2
Arithmetic Concepts	5.2	5.3	5.4	6.0	6.1	6.0	6.8	7.2	6.6
Grade 9 (Norm)				(9.9)		(9.9)			
Paragraph Meaning	5.4	--	5.2	6.4	--	6.3	7.7	--	7.6
Language	4.9	--	4.8	5.8	--	5.9	7.2	--	7.1
Arithmetic Computation	5.7	--	5.4	6.6	--	6.3	8.2	--	7.8
Arithmetic Concepts	6.2	--	6.0	7.1	--	6.9	8.1	--	8.0

same as reported for 1968. Dates of administration permit direct comparison at all grades except 5 and 6, where the grade norm may be used to make adjustments as differences are examined.

In general, the data in Table 12 corroborate the generalizations suggested by target - control comparisons. Target school quartiles show much consistency over the three years. Where comparable measurements have yielded different results, negative differences are at least as common as positive ones. The sole exception is again at grade 7, where quartile grade equivalents are generally higher for 1968.

In view of the low achievement criterion for selection of project pupils, a more careful look at Q_1 results seems advisable. Such an examination of the data again reveals nothing indicative of great impact. Over all grades and subtests where comparable results are available for 1966 and 1968, there is a net gain of eight months of achievement at Q_1 . At first glance, this bit of positive evidence seems insignificant. Comparison with Q_2 and Q_3 results, however, causes one to look a second time. At Q_2 there is, overall, a net loss of eight months of achievement from 1966 to 1968, and at Q_3 , a net decrease of 26 months. This finding suggests that the Title I program may be holding the lowest quarter of the school population at a rather constant achievement level while overall, because of changing population or other considerations, the achievement of target school pupils is declining.

This question was further studied by averaging the grade equivalents at the tenth percentile for each of the target and control schools over the three-year period. This approach was feasible only at the intermediate level. In comparing the changes that have taken place in these averages in target vs. control schools, it was found that at grade four and five the average grade equivalent for the tenth percentile has increased since 1966 in both target and control schools. The increase is larger among

Table 13. Average Differences Between Actual Median Sixth Grade Achievement and Medians Predicted from Various School Unit Data, By Type of School, Subtest, and Prediction Source.

	TARGET	CONTROL
Paragraph Meaning		
Socio-Economic Status	- .1	- .2
Intelligence Quotient	+ .1	+ .1
Paragraph Meaning Median	0	+ .1
Arithmetic Computation		
Socio-Economic Status	- .1	- .1
Intelligence Quotient	0	+ .1
Arithmetic Computation Median	- .2	+ .2

target schools, however, amounting to over two months at grade 4 and over three months at grade 5. Grade 6, on the other hand, shows a slight decline among both target and control schools.

A final approach used to study achievement is reported in Table 13. With data for a three-year period on numerous characteristics of elementary school units, regression equations were calculated and used to predict median sixth grade achievement for 1967-68. Actual Paragraph Meaning and Arithmetic Computation medians were compared with predictions based on 1966-67 data concerning socio-economic status, I.Q., and median achievement on the same subtests. Table 13 shows the average differences for target and control groups between the actual and predicted medians.

The data collection and analysis processes underlying Table 13 are complex and could be discussed at length. Primarily, however, they are part of a developing effort to increase the store of information available for evaluating local school program. These data and analytic methods will be applied more extensively in the 1968-69 program evaluation. A detailed description will be presented in that report. For present purposes, it suffices to say that differences between predicted and actual achievement tended to favor control schools over target schools. Thus, still another item of evidence is added to indicate the absence of impact of Title I program on total target school achievement.

Conclusions

The diverse approaches to the study of pupil academic achievement presented in this chapter lead to the following conclusions:

1. There is still no evidence that the Title I program is having an overall beneficial effect on target school achievement. Both cross-sectional and longitudinal examination of achievement data indicate that total distributions of target school achievement test scores have been unaffected by attempts to build a stronger educational program for the disadvantaged.

2. Although the picture is far from clear, there is limited evidence to suggest that pupils at the lower achievement levels served by special Title I services may be exhibiting some benefit. At least, the lower quarter of achievement distributions seems to be "holding its own" in the face of a slight overall decline in total target school achievement. The effect of the program on achievement of the pupils receiving significant services needs to be assessed with greater precision in future years.
3. The deviation of target school pupils from national norms continues to present a perplexing challenge. With an average annual achievement of about six months, the target school pupil falls farther and farther behind the norm for his grade level. The inability of the Title I program to effect dramatic changes in this picture, although not surprising, underscores the need for educators to search continually for more effective means of doing their job. But it points also to the importance of intensified public support of education that will make it possible to multiply several times over the resources available to meet this challenge.

Summary

No other educational objective is so commonly seen to be the schools' responsibility as raising academic achievement. In a program designed to improve the education of disadvantaged pupils, therefore, the results of standardized achievement tests are crucially important to appraisal of success. This report compares the quartile points of achievement test grade equivalent distributions for target schools, cross-sectionally with those of control schools and longitudinally with the results of comparable measurements in each of the past two years.

The generalized finding of this report is absence of favorable evidence. The Title I program appears to be having little or no effect on the overall achievement of target school pupils. There is limited evidence to suggest a more positive effect on pupils at lower achievement levels. Overall, the record of target school achievement brings out very clearly the importance of continually increasing investment in this educational effort and ongoing determination on the part of educators to find more effective ways of teaching the disadvantaged child.

CHAPTER 7

PROMOTION RATES, 1967-68

Background

Of high priority in nearly every educational program is the goal of improving pupil achievement. Standardized tests are likely to be the best instruments for measuring success in attaining this goal. Promotion rates, however, provide an added index of pupils' academic progress. Although they are considerably more subjective in character, the percentages of pupils who are advanced regularly from grade to grade reflect professional judgment of the extent to which pupils fit whatever criteria are used for promotional decisions.

It would be clearly unreasonable to use promotion rates to evaluate a program's effectiveness if these criteria were not similar to the objectives of the program. In other words, promotion rates can be considered indicative only of the program's effectiveness in accomplishing those ends which are the basis for promotion. One must also be willing to assume the validity and reliability of promotion rates. If teacher judgments about pupil readiness for promotion are grossly inaccurate, or if standards vary considerably from school to school or from year to year, little meaning can be derived from comparisons involving promotion statistics.

As reported in previous years' Title I evaluation, promotion rates are expressed as the quotient resulting from the ratio of the number of pupils advanced to the end of year membership, i.e., the percentage of pupils finishing the school year who are advanced to the next grade. The Cincinnati school system operates on a full year's promotion basis. At the elementary level a pupil is either advanced or retained for all of the work of a given grade. Promotion at the secondary level, on the other hand,

is by subject, with grade placement designation determined by the number of subjects passed or credits earned. It is possible, therefore, for a pupil in one secondary grade to be taking some subjects at a different grade level.

The first year's Title I evaluation report established a five-year promotion baseline (1960-61 through 1964-65) for primary target, secondary target, and control schools. Compared with these rates were the percentages for 1965-66, the first (partial) year of Title I services. From this initial comparison several conclusions emerged. It was found, first of all, that promotion rates tend to rise from a low at first grade level through each of the five succeeding elementary school grades, then to decrease at the seventh grade, and generally to increase again through the other junior high school years. Secondly, the control school grouping showed higher promotion rates than primary target and secondary target schools. Thirdly, primary target promotion rates rose in 1966, especially at the junior high school level; secondary target rates, on the other hand, showed a marked decline.

The extension of this report in 1966-67 revealed the secondary target schools recovering from the previous year's low promotion rates. Thus, the net effect for all three classes of schools was an increase over the five-year baseline period. In 1966-67, primary target schools had the lowest percentage of promotion, followed by secondary target, and then control.

Method of Analysis

This comparison strategy was modified for the 1967-68 evaluation. Because the Title I services provided in secondary target schools were minimal, it was decided to use a number of these schools as a control

group. At the elementary level, the six schools ranking highest in economic indigence were chosen, while at the secondary level, the three junior high schools in the secondary target group were now identified as controls. City-wide promotion rates were used for additional comparison. Percentages were compared by grade and type of school with the baseline data and the percentages of the two previous years of Title I service.

Results

Promotion rates for the five year baseline period and each succeeding year since the initiation of Title I are presented in Table 14. This table permits comparison of the target school promotion percentages by grade from kindergarten through grade 9. Changes that have occurred in target school rates since the Title I program was begun can be viewed in comparison with those that have taken place in control school percentages and in city-wide promotion rates. Since the control group did not include a senior high school, target school promotion percentages for grades 10, 11, and 12 can be compared only with the city-wide rates.

The year 1967-68 marked a decline in target school promotion. The unweighted average of promotion percentages for all grades decreased 1.5 percent from the preceding year. Although this difference may seem small, it should not be minimized. The percentages are based upon a large number of pupils, and the variance among promotion rates is relatively low. Thus, the decline is probably more than a chance difference. It should be noted, however, that the overall promotion percentages for the system also showed an average decline. This unweighted mean decreased from 94.7 per cent in 1966-67 to 93.7 per cent in 1967-68. Still, this is a somewhat smaller drop than that for the target schools.

Table 14. Percentages of Pupils Promoted, by School Group, Year, and Grade.

GRADE	TARGET SCHOOLS				CONTROL SCHOOLS				ALL SCHOOLS			
	Base- line	65-66	66-67	67-68	Base- line	65-66	66-67	67-68	Base- line	65-66	66-67	67-68
12	91.8%	89.0%	86.5%	81.0%	---	---	---	---	93.8%	93.1%	94.1%	94.2%
11	91.5	85.8	86.5	85.0	---	---	---	---	93.4	92.5	91.7	87.8
10	87.9	90.4	85.8	88.4	---	---	---	---	90.7	90.4	91.6	86.4
9	88.8	95.7	92.0	84.6	93.2%	95.5%	94.8%	93.1%	91.5	92.0	93.3	91.9
8	88.6	92.8	91.9	86.7	91.8	92.7	94.1	92.0	91.7	91.8	94.6	91.3
7	88.9	90.7	92.3	89.6	93.1	94.6	93.3	94.6	91.5	91.2	94.1	92.1
6	98.6	98.5	98.9	99.9	97.0	99.8	99.6	99.8	98.5	99.4	99.5	99.7
5	96.6	97.4	97.3	99.5	92.2	98.5	96.9	98.0	96.5	97.7	96.8	98.3
4	94.3	94.8	96.6	96.4	91.3	97.6	96.4	97.0	94.9	96.3	96.6	96.8
3	94.4	93.8	97.2	97.4	93.6	97.5	98.2	97.4	95.8	96.8	97.7	97.6
2	93.5	94.2	93.8	90.5	93.9	96.9	94.9	95.0	94.1	95.7	95.3	95.2
1	81.7	80.2	79.7	78.7	75.9	86.3	78.9	81.1	85.5	88.7	86.3	87.1
K	99.8	99.9	99.5	100.0	99.9	99.7	99.5	99.0	99.8	99.9	99.8	99.8
* K-9	92.5	93.8	93.9	92.3	92.2	95.9	94.7	94.7	94.0	95.0	95.4	95.0
* 10-12	90.4	88.4	86.3	84.8	---	---	---	---	92.6	92.0	92.5	89.5
* K-12	92.0	92.6	92.2	91.0	---	---	---	---	93.7	94.3	94.7	93.7

*Unweighted average.

A closer look at target school rates indicates that the decrease was rather evenly divided between the K-9 and 10-12 groups. This is in contrast to the pattern for the control and city-wide percentages. Among control schools the unweighted average for grades K-9 remained almost the same as in 1966-67. Similarly, there was little difference in the two years for the city-wide rates.

In other words, for the city as a whole the lower 1967-68 promotion rates were traceable almost entirely to a rather sharp decline in senior high school promotion, specifically in grades 10 and 11. By contrast, among target schools, tenth grade promotion was higher in 1967-68, grade 11 showed a 1.5 per cent decline, and grade 12 dropped 5.5 per cent, a more drastic decline than at any other grade level except grade 9.

At the junior high school level, promotion rates declined for all three grades. Grades 8 and 9 showed the largest decrease. Rates for each of these two grades had risen sharply over the baseline period with the first year of Title I service. The percentages have decreased in each of the two succeeding years to the point where they are now lower than for the baseline period.

At the elementary level, the rates show less change from 1966-67 to 1967-68. Of the seven grades, four show an increase, the largest (2.2%) occurring at the fifth grade. Of the three lower percentages, the greatest change is at the second grade, where promotion rates decreased 3.3 per cent over the preceding year.

Viewing the target school percentages longitudinally from the baseline period forward reveals several interesting changes. First, there is a gradual decline in the regularity of promotion from first to second grade. A mixed pattern occurs at grade 2, with 1967-68 reflecting a new low rate for this grade. Grades 3 through 6 show a general tendency toward higher rates with each succeeding year.

In other words, at the elementary level, increased emphasis has been placed on early identification of pupils who should be retained, so that grade 1, which has generally been considered the best level for retention, has showed a continuous decrease in the percentage of target pupils promoted. This pattern is definitely less visible in control and city-wide rates, suggesting that closer attention to pupil diagnosis through smaller classes, additional supportive personnel, more frequent evaluation, etc., has contributed to this phenomenon among target schools.

At the secondary level, the pattern for the junior high school grades has already been discussed. After an early increase at the start of Title I, the rates have dropped off through 1967-68. At the senior high school level, grades 10 and 11 show a rather mixed pattern, while grade 12 percentages have decreased at a rather alarming rate since the Title I program began.

Conclusions

Updating the report of promotion rates contained in the 1966-67 evaluation permits a comparison of target school, control school, and city-wide percentages, which leads to the following conclusions:

1. Promotion of target school pupils declined in 1967-68. After the first few academic years of Title I service, in which promotion rates over all grades remained relatively stable among primary target schools, an average decrease was noted at the end of the 1967-68 school year. City-wide rates also declined somewhat, following a gradual increase in each of the two preceding years.
2. Primary target grades accounting for the decline were 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 12. With the exception of grades 8 and 9, all these showed an increase over the previous year among control schools, where promotion rates were, in general, fairly stable. The decline in the system-wide percentages was traceable almost entirely to lower rates in grades 10 and 11.
3. Target school teachers and administrators appear to be retaining pupils in the early grades with increasing frequency, while promotion rates in grades three through six show a pattern of gradual rise. The target school promotion percentage for grade one has declined slightly in each of the three years since the baseline was established. Grade two promotions were up in 1965-66, but they decreased in 1966-67 and fell off somewhat sharply in the most recent year.

4. The largest decreases in target school promotion occurred at grades 9 and 12. Causative factors underlying this phenomenon are unknown and may be complex. No explanation is suggested by rates among control schools or over the entire system.
5. By comparison with the baseline, 1967-68 promotion rates are higher in kindergarten and in grades 3, 4, 6, 7, and 10. These increases are all fairly small, so that the lower rates for other grades result in a net decrease.

Summary

On the premise that promotion rates offer some evidence of pupil achievement to be added to results of standardized tests, data on percentage of promotion have been assembled since the first Title I evaluation report. Working forward from a five-year baseline period, data have been compiled for each of the three years in which Title I services have been offered. In this year's report, target and control school promotion rates are compared by grade level along with total city-wide rates.

This comparison points up a decline in target school promotion in 1967-68. This decrease takes the promotion rate below the level of the baseline for target schools. The overall decline is a function of increasing retention of elementary pupils in grades one and two as well as higher failure rates in the three junior high school grades and in grade 12.

CHAPTER 8

PUPIL ATTENDANCE, 1967-68

Background

Pupil attendance at school is considered a reasonable barometer of attitude and interest. Although a certain amount of absence for illness and the like is inevitable, pupils who have little or no interest in school find many more reasons for being absent. On the other hand, highly motivated pupils often attend school despite physical ailments. Absence that is necessary and legal, therefore, tends to balance out in any comparison over a period of time.

In the first year of Title I evaluation, baseline data were established on average percentage of daily absence (APDA) over a five-year period among primary target, secondary target and control schools. Inter-group comparisons of these data led to three generalizations. The first was that secondary level absence (grades 9-12) was consistently greater than that for elementary schools. Secondly, primary target school absence perennially exceeded that for secondary target schools, with control schools showing the lowest rates. Finally, differences among primary target, secondary target, and control schools at the elementary level were smaller than those at the secondary level, leading to the inference that absence yields a more sensitive reflection of pupil attitudes at the secondary level.

Study of changes taking place among the three groups of schools was part of the 1966-67 program evaluation. APDA for the five-year period preceding the initiation of Title I was compared with that for each of the next two years. Several basic conclusions were drawn from this study. First, there was a general increase in primary target school absence

rates from the five base years to 1965-66 and to 1966-67. This increase was greater than that for secondary target or control schools, so that absence rates continued to be highest in primary target schools, followed by secondary target and then control. The primary target schools' rate of increase was higher in secondary grades than in elementary. Finally, from grade to grade, absence rates in all schools tended to decrease from grade one to grade three, to rise again in grades 4-6, to jump sharply at grade seven, and to be somewhat higher at grade 9.

Method of Analysis

By 1966-67, Education Act Title I services had begun to be phased out of secondary target schools. Thus, consistent with other analyses in this report, absence data were regrouped to permit comparison of target school grades with those of a group of schools more similar in character. At the elementary level, the eight secondary target schools ranking highest in economic indigence were selected as a control group. The three junior high schools that had been secondary targets were used for comparison at the secondary level.

Data from the five year baseline period from 1961 through 1965 were recomputed for this new school grouping. APDA at each grade was figured for the five year baseline period in target and control schools as well as on a city-wide basis.

Results

Absence rates for grades 1 through 12 in target schools are compared with similar rates in control schools and over the entire school system in Table 15. Rates for the 1967-68 school year are compared with those of each of the two preceding years and of a five year baseline period from 1960-61 to 1964-65.

Viewed in terms of the unweighted average for all grades, target absence rates increased in 1967-68, as they have for each year since the baseline was established. It should be noted, however, that this increase was smaller than that of either preceding year and also smaller than that of the city-wide average for all grades. Target school absence rates increased .6 per cent in 1967-68, compared with 1.0 per cent in 1966-67 and 1.2 per cent from the baseline period to 1965-66. City-wide rates, meanwhile, have also increased each year, but prior to 1967-68 the rate of increase was less than that for target schools. In the most recent year, on the other hand, the city-wide absence rate jumped from 8.7 to 10.8 per cent, an increase of 2.1 per cent.

This deceleration of increase in target schools is the function of an unprecedented decrease in absence in the elementary and junior high school grades. Target school absence for grades 1 through 9 decreased from 11.1 per cent in 1966-67 to 9.5 per cent in 1967-68. This percentage, the lowest for any year since the initiation of Title I services, brings the target absence rate .2 per cent below the baseline period. Target elementary and junior high schools showed lower absence in every grade except 4, with the greatest decreases occurring at the junior high school level and at grade 1. Even though control school and city-wide absence also decreased slightly in the elementary grades, intermediate

Table 15. Average Percentage of Daily Absence, by School Group, Year, and Grade.

GRADE	TARGET SCHOOLS				CONTROL SCHOOLS				ALL SCHOOLS			
	Base- line	65-66	66-67	67-68	Base- line	65-66	66-67	67-68	Base- line	65-66	66-67	67-68
12	7.0%	9.2%	10.1%	12.7%	---	---	---	---	6.4%	7.3%	8.4%	11.0%
11	9.7	12.6	13.4	15.4	---	---	---	---	7.5	8.9	9.4	12.8
10	12.3	12.8	14.4	18.2	---	---	---	---	9.2	10.2	10.7	14.8
9	13.9	15.6	17.5	14.4	10.0%	10.9%	11.0%	13.4%	9.3	10.4	10.8	13.6
8	14.5	15.9	16.7	13.4	9.9	10.0	10.3	12.3	8.1	10.1	10.5	12.5
7	13.4	13.7	14.9	12.5	8.5	8.4	9.7	10.6	8.9	9.2	9.6	11.5
6	7.3	7.3	8.3	7.8	6.4	6.6	6.7	6.9	6.0	5.9	6.4	6.6
5	7.1	7.8	8.3	7.3	7.3	6.8	6.7	7.6	6.1	6.3	6.2	6.4
4	7.0	7.2	7.4	8.0	6.8	6.4	7.0	7.6	6.3	6.1	6.3	6.5
3	6.2	6.9	7.3	7.0	7.0	6.9	7.3	7.1	6.3	6.1	6.3	6.2
2	8.1	8.0	8.2	7.0	7.7	7.3	7.8	7.6	7.2	7.0	6.9	6.7
1	10.1	10.2	11.2	8.2	9.7	9.7	9.8	9.2	9.1	8.4	8.3	7.7
* 1-9	9.7	10.3	11.1	9.5	8.1	8.1	8.5	9.1	7.5	7.7	7.9	8.6
* 10-12	9.7	11.5	12.6	15.4	---	---	---	---	7.7	8.8	9.5	12.9
* 1-12	9.7	10.9	11.9	12.5	---	---	---	---	7.6	8.3	8.7	10.8

*Unweighted Average.

grade absence showed a small increase, and junior high school rates rose appreciably in 1967-68. Thus, both the control and city-wide groups show an overall increase of more than .7 per cent in grades 1 through 9.

Despite this improvement, however, target school rates, even at the elementary and junior high school levels, remain somewhat higher than the percentages for the control school group and for all schools in the city. Thus, although the 1967-68 decline in absence rates among target elementary and junior high schools may be heralded as a real success, there can be no question of the continuing need to focus on pupil motivation and to provide health, adjustment and other supportive services that will contribute to further improvement of target school attendance.

The lower absence rates among target junior high schools are worthy of special consideration. This decrease brings the percentage for each grade, 7, 8, and 9, within 1.0 per cent of the comparable city-wide rate. By comparison, the five-year baseline period showed target school seventh grade absence to be 4.5 per cent higher than the city-wide rate, eighth grade 6.4 per cent higher and ninth grade 4.6 per cent higher. Comparison with junior high school control rates yields a similar, but less dramatic, picture. It seems appropriate, therefore, to make an effort to trace the causes of this decline in target junior high school absence and to reinforce and diffuse whatever elements of the program may seem to be contributing to this improvement.

The overall increase in the unweighted average for target schools is due, obviously, to higher rates at the senior high school level. In the one target senior high school, absence increased 3.8 per cent at grade 10, 2.0 per cent at grade 11 and 2.6 per cent at grade 12. Although these increases bring the senior high school rates in the target school to a new

high, with absence in each grade exceeding that for the school system as a whole, still the rate of increase in 1967-68 was less in the target school. The unweighted average for grades 10-12 increased 2.8 per cent in the target school and 3.4 per cent system wide. The year 1967-68 was one of civil disturbance and cultural unrest in the schools. At the senior high school level, particularly, pupils stayed out of school, sometimes in protest and sometimes in fear. Attendance in the target senior high school seems to have suffered less from this series of events than other senior high schools in the city.

Conclusions

A number of conclusions may readily be drawn from this longitudinal and cross-sectional comparison of absence rates.

1. Based on an unweighted average of absence rates in grades 1 through 12, the rate of acceleration of target school absence decreased in 1967-68. The percentage increase was less than in either of the two preceding years and also less than that of the city-wide rate.
2. At the elementary level, five of the six target school percentages showed a decrease in 1967-68. The greatest improvement was at grade one; only grade four failed to show some decline in absence. By comparison, control and city-wide rates decreased slightly at the primary grade level but increased in the intermediate grades.
3. Most encouraging is the decreased absence rate for target junior high schools. While both control and system-wide rates for grades 7, 8, and 9 were increasing, target school percentages showed a substantial decline. This positive evidence should be looked at more carefully in an attempt to ascertain causes and to reinforce and diffuse program benefits.
4. Target senior high school absence increased in 1967, but at a lesser rate than that for the system as a whole. This rate of increase, exceeding that of either of the two preceding years, was great enough to result in an increase in the unweighted average of all grades in target schools.

5. Target school absence rates remain higher than system-wide rates at every grade level. Continuing effort to promote better attendance is essential to the success of every phase of the school program. Pupils who are not present in school can hardly benefit from program services made possible through Title I funds.

Summary

Average Percentage of Daily Absence may be interpreted as an indicator of pupil attitude. This report compares target school absence rates by grade, for a five year baseline period and for each of the three years of Title I service, with similar rates in control schools and over the entire system.

The data presented here show decreased target school absence in grades 1 through 9 and especially at the junior high school level. Even in grades 10 through 12, the percentage of increase is smaller than that for the system as a whole. Despite this very promising improvement, target school absence rates remain higher than system-wide rates at every grade level.

CHAPTER 9

DROPOUTS, 1967-68

Background

As a barometer of program impact, dropout data are unique. At the secondary level, there is probably no more relevant index of program effectiveness, particularly among ninth and tenth grade pupils. These same data, however, have no meaning below the seventh grade.

The literature abounds with discussion on how to deal with dropouts and, more extensively, how to prevent them. Probably the most recurring aim is increased relevance of the educational program to stimulate motivation and prevent failure. Adding relevance has been a cardinal goal in the structure of Title I services for secondary pupils in Cincinnati. If the program is successful, therefore, one of its effects should be a noticeable decrease in the drop-out rate, particularly at the senior high school level.

Dropout data have been assembled and presented in each of the previous program evaluation reports. A key problem in the treatment of data has been the fact that, although dropout information is most meaningful at the senior high school level, there has been only one (primary) target senior high school. The secondary target and control groups of previous years have not included a senior high school because it was felt that none is comparable. The approach used to examine dropout data, therefore, has been to compare rates at the junior high school level among primary target, secondary target and control schools and to focus the examination of senior high school rates on a comparison of target with non-target. This study has been longitudinal in that, in the beginning, a baseline of two years' data was established and each of the two succeeding years have been compared with this baseline.

The working definition used for the term dropout includes any pupils who leave school before graduation or completion of a program of studies without transferring to another full-time school program. It should be noted that this definition includes many pupils who eventually attain their educational goal, perhaps through a less structured program than that of the regular day school. It must also be pointed out that local dropout data have not included pupils who finish a given school year and fail to return for program continuation in the fall. It has been virtually impossible to obtain accurate information for the period from June to September. Very specifically, then, for the purposes of this report and those which have preceded, dropouts are defined as pupils identified through reports of census changes as leaving school under one of the following reasons in the period from September to June: government services, pregnancy, illness, work permits, home permits, psychological exclusion, superintendent's expulsion, and age beyond compulsory attendance. Also included is an ambiguous miscellaneous category; most often the disposition of these cases is pending at the time of withdrawal.

Dropout rate is computed by dividing the number of such dropouts by the number of pupils for whom the school is accountable (dropouts + end of year membership). This total accountability figure includes all pupils enrolled in a school in a given year except those who have been withdrawn as deceased or for whom it is reasonable to assume that full-time education was continued. Graduating seniors are counted in the twelfth grade end of year membership.

Method of Analysis

The strategy employed for study of dropout rates in previous years is continued in this report. Dropout data are assembled by grade for primary

target and control schools. Comparisons are made of 1967-68 statistics with those of each of the two previous years of Title I service and with the two-year baseline period that preceded.

Results

Table 16 shows the dropout percentages for each of the secondary level grades in target schools, in control schools, and over the entire system. These grades are presented for each of five years, beginning with 1963-64. The first two years represent the pre-Title I period that may be considered as a baseline. The years are kept separate because of the disparity in rates, particularly in the target senior high school. The year 1965-66 was a partial year of Title I services; the secondary project was just getting underway in the final months of the school year.

Of chief interest in this report is 1967-68. It is encouraging to note a decrease in the target school dropout rates in this most recent year. Only grade 12 fails to show a decline. The 3.7 per cent increase in pupils dropping out in their last year should certainly cause some concern. The crucial grades 10 and 11 show a substantial decrease, but the largest improvement is at grade 9 where the dropout rate decreased from 11.1 per cent in 1966-67 to 5.5 per cent in 1967-68. As a result, the unweighted average for grades 7 to 9 is 2.8 per cent lower than in 1966-67. For grades 10 to 12 the decrease is .6 per cent, and over all grades the average target school dropout rate is down 1.7 per cent.

At the senior high school level, each of the three grades shows a higher dropout rate in 1967-68 than in 1965-66, the first year under Title I. The percentages for grades 11 and 12 are also higher than in either of the two baseline years. Thus it becomes clear that the 1967-68 decrease of the senior high school level is a function of high percentages in 1966-67.

Table 16. Dropout Rates, by School Group, Year, and Grade.

GRADE	TARGET SCHOOLS					CONTROL SCHOOLS					ALL SCHOOLS				
	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67	67-68	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67	67-68	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67	67-68
12	6.2%	9.1%	6.2%	7.8%	11.5%	---	---	---	---	---	4.3%	4.1%	4.7%	4.8%	5.5%
11	11.0	13.0	13.7	17.1	14.4	---	---	---	---	---	6.2	6.0	8.2	10.2	8.3
10	12.6	16.0	10.7	14.5	11.5	---	---	---	---	---	7.3	7.1	9.1	10.3	7.7
9	9.1	8.9	10.4	11.1	5.5	6.8%	6.8%	7.3%	7.5%	4.5%	6.1	5.4	6.4	6.7	3.6
8	5.0	5.7	4.9	5.2	2.6	3.5	2.9	3.9	4.0	1.8	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.8	1.6
7	2.0	1.7	2.0	1.2	1.0	1.8	1.7	1.2	1.8	1.4	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.0
* 7-9	5.4	5.4	5.8	5.8	3.0	4.0	3.8	4.1	4.4	2.6	3.6	3.2	3.5	3.6	2.1
* 10-12	9.9	12.7	10.2	13.1	12.5	---	---	---	---	---	5.9	5.7	7.3	8.4	7.2
* 7-12	7.7	9.1	8.0	9.5	7.8	---	---	---	---	---	4.8	4.5	5.4	6.0	4.6

*Unweighted average.

Furthermore, control and city-wide dropout rates also declined in 1967-68. This suggests more strongly that the decline in the target school percentages was not associated with the Title I program. Changes in city-wide rates in fact follow those in target school percentages to a surprising degree. Here also, every grade but 12 shows a decline in 1967-68. Rates at grades 8 and 9 are cut almost in half, and those at 10 and 11 also show a substantial decrease. Because the city-wide rate for twelfth graders increased less, there is a larger decline in the overall average among all schools. This average fell to 4.6 per cent, a decrease of 1.4 per cent from 1966-67.

Control school rates (junior high school only) also showed a decline at each grade level. This average went from 4.4 per cent in 1966-67 to 2.6 per cent in 1967-68.

Both control and city-wide junior high school rates remain below those for the target schools. Even more disturbing is the extent to which target school percentages at the senior high school level continue to be higher than the city-wide rates. Even at grade 10, where the percentage is below that of both baseline years, the target rate is 4.1 per cent higher than that for all secondary schools in the system. There can be no doubt, then, of a continuing need to build more meaning and attractiveness into the school program for disadvantaged secondary school youth. Efforts to provide adequate guidance services, to insure worthy employment after graduation, and to attend to welfare needs of these pupils must be intensified. The effectiveness of any attempt to improve the school program must be judged as somewhat limited while over 12 per cent of the senior high school youth continue to cease their education pursuits between September and June of each academic year.

Conclusions

Three primary conclusions may be drawn from this survey of changes in dropout rates.

1. Some factor or combination of factors led to an overall decrease in target school dropout rates in 1967-68. Every grade except grade 12 showed a decline from the preceding year.
2. This decrease, although encouraging, is apparently not associated with the Title I program. It appears to be, rather, largely a function of the high dropout percentages of the preceding year. A comparable city-wide decrease also suggests that some influences outside the Title I program played a role in effecting the lower rates.
3. Target school dropout rates continue to be higher than control school and city-wide rates. This fact suggests that those efforts that seem to hold the most promise of keeping pupils in school until graduation be intensified.

Summary

Pupils who drop out of school in the secondary level grades generally have failed to see the school program as vital in their lives. Any program that seeks to improve the education of disadvantaged pupils must, above all, motivate them to stay in school.

This report has compared dropout rates in target schools with control and city-wide rates over a five year period. Except for grade 12, all percentages decreased in 1967-68. This decrease, however, is apparently not associated with the Title I program. The continuing high percentages of dropouts in target secondary schools underscores the need for an ongoing strengthening of dropout prevention efforts.

CHAPTER 10

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The report contained in this issue of the Journal is a piece of history. The mission of the writer was to maintain continuity in the recording of Title I evaluation. This objective has been achieved.

To the prospective reader, the tardy appearance of the report will surely detract from its interest value. It is not anticipated that this document will be read with eagerness by a large group of educators. Nor, probably, should it be. It does seem relevant to point out that some of the characteristics that will deter the reader also caused the value of preparing the report to obscure itself from the writer's view from time to time.

In the first place, the document under production was clearly not a timely one. The data seen as necessary for decision making had already been processed and reported more informally to persons charged with these responsibilities. Analyzing the remainder of the data and preparing a formal report sometimes seemed to be little more than an academic exercise consuming time that could have been better spent.

Secondly, because of changes that had been made in the Title I educational program, this evaluation had limited relevance to the current structure of Title I activities. Data based on the intermediate grade population, for example, are of slight interest when the current elementary project concerns only primary grade pupils. Certain criterion measures, also, such as Arithmetic achievement tests, have lost their relevance because of program changes.

Thirdly, it is difficult to stimulate enthusiasm for a report which for the third consecutive year fails to reveal substantial positive results. From the beginning it has been recognized that changes,

especially such that would be discernable through standard educational measurement, would be very slow to appear among disadvantaged children. When the intent of a report is to assess gross changes in target school population, rather than results of specific project services, the likelihood of marked change is even less. Recognition of these facts, however, helps only a little in stimulating enthusiasm for the reporting task.

In retrospect, each of the factors detracting from the apparent worthwhileness of the task of composing this report has had a concomitant beneficial effect. First, the demand for evaluative data for use in decision making prior to completion of the processing and analysis of the complete body of information is itself a promising sign. Local decision makers are apparently becoming more aware of the importance of looking objectively at the effectiveness of the educational program. This, in turn, has necessitated planning various approaches to reporting evaluative findings. More emphasis is being placed on direct interpersonal reaction to evaluative findings as presented orally or in simplified written reports.

A second benefit derived from the factors spelled out above is a refinement of measurement tools. With the substantial changes that occurred in the Title I program at the start of the 1968-69 school year, it seemed advisable to look critically at the instruments that were being used, particularly the standardized achievement tests. Many local professional personnel had become convinced that the achievement tests being used in Title I evaluation, despite their apparent conformity to the local curricula, were inappropriate for the disadvantaged child, particularly the child at the bottom of the achievement scale. Through the efforts of ad-hoc committees, new tests, holding more promise of suitability, were selected and introduced in the 1968-69 academic year.

Finally, continuing lack of significant findings has made the evaluation staff more conscious of the need to exhaust all possibilities in finding any trace of impact that might be concealed in the data. A more thorough and sophisticated treatment is thus being given to evaluative data collected in the 1968-69 school year. Particularly in project evaluation, there will be much more precise focus on the educational treatment received by specific pupils. In program evaluation, the data that have been treated in each of the three years to date, will be supplemented with a wealth of school unit information from the School Management Information System that is being piloted locally.

All of these advances will be reflected in the evaluation reports from the 1968-69 school year. Hopefully, the net result of such improvements will be uncovering any impact of Title I that exists in reality, or if, in fact, the program has had no real effect, at least suggesting the direction toward which future efforts to educate the disadvantaged child should be aimed.